DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 465 SO 023 425

AUTHOR Bickmore, Kathy
TITLE Learning Inclusion/Inclusion in Learning: Citizenship Education for a Plural Society.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; *Cultural Pluralism; Curriculum Evaluation; *Democracy; High Schools; Multicultural Education; Public Schools; Role Models; *Socialization; *Social Studies; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This research involves case studies of four public high school teachers handling and modeling the problem of inclusion in their social studies classrooms. In interpreting and implementing social studies curriculum, teachers represent to their students particular images of citizenship, leadership, and the political system in which these are embedded. In hidden as well as overt social studies curriculum, students are shown what kinds of people may be social or political actors, and shown what kinds of behaviors are expected of citizens. Curriculum may attempt to foster love of country by emphasizing similarity and unanimity, minimizing conflict, or alternatively by emphasizing the wide scope of valued members in the national community, using conflict as a learning opportunity. For this study, contrasting versions of implemented social studies curriculum in their living form, including students' and teachers' words and deeds, in four high school classrooms in two economically and ethnically diverse districts were observed. The result of the data collection is a detailed picture of four implemented social studies curricula in specific multiethnic contexts, and a flavor of each teacher's reflections about their own work. The study concludes that classroom conflict is very often avoided. One teacher generally avoided conflict in either curricular substance or pedagogical process by focusing on independent seatwork. Another teacher in the same school used both pedagogical conflict and curricular conflict. The third used simple curricular content coupled with an open climate of conflictual discussion. The last teacher presented conflictual information by means of tightly teacher controlled pedagogical strategies. (DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 362 465

Learning Inclusion/Inclusion in Learning:
Citizenship Education for a Plural Society

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

KATHY BICKMORE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 023 425

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Learning Inclusion/Inclusion in Learning: Citizenship Education for a Plural Society

presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, April 16, 1993

Kathy Bickmore
Department of Curriculum and Foundations of Education
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

> *Most governments* have been based, practically, on the denial of equal rights. . . . *Ours* began by *affirming* those rights. *They* said, some [people] are too *ignorant*, and *vicious*, to share in government. Possibly so, said we; and, by your system, you would always keep them ignorant, and vicious. We proposed to give *all* a chance; and we expected the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant, wiser, and all better, happier together. We made the experiment, and the fruit is before us.
>
> -- Abraham Lincoln, 1854 *(emphasis in original)*.

One hundred forty years ago, Abraham Lincoln asserted that giving "all" a chance to develop into strong and informed citizens was essential to our nation's democratic experiment. During and since Lincoln's time, there has been continual struggle to broaden the theory and practice of *who* may be meant by "all." There have always been groups of citizens -- for example poor, female, non-white, or recent immigrants -- whose right "to share in government" is not fully honored or realized. This paper is concerned with the operational extension of citizenship to the diverse generation of young people now in high school. How can social studies curriculum, the school subject most directly responsible for citizenship education, prepare "the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant wiser, and all better, happier together"?

Citizenship is membership, especially in a nation-state community. In practice, membership carries the potential for both inclusivity and exclusivity. On the one hand, education for the new "members" of our national community can be oriented toward norms for good behavior, including support for the current regime. As in many clubs, this orientation tends toward exclusivity because it teaches consensus rather than affirming dissent and it implies that members must earn (through conforming) the privilege of belonging. Alternatively, citizenship education can be oriented toward preparation and development of skills. This view tends toward inclusivity because it affirms the importance of new members, new voices, dissent, and change. If a democracy is to broaden its base and deepen its participatory structure, then citizenship education rests upon inclusion, mutual challenge, and participation in preparing for the future.

The society for which we are preparing our students is conflictual -- because it is pluralist, because it is democratic (protective of dissent), and because it is changing rapidly. Teachers create miniature social systems in their classrooms, in which politically-relevant behavior (for example, attitudes toward authority or ways of handling conflict) is modeled and practiced. Practice of new behaviors is important for solidifying both learning gains and attitude change. Bandura demonstrates that one may learn generalized ideas or attitudes, as well as specific behaviors, through observing and copying respected models (1986). When involvement in and practice with resolving genuine conflict is encouraged, students have an opportunity to gain confidence and skill in communication, problem-solving, and negotiation (Deutch 1973, Johnson & Johnson 1979, Smith et.al.1981). This suggests that classroom practice in such tasks as problem-solving, identifying and taking alternate perspectives, and analyzing divergent sources of information can result in behavior, skills, and attitudes that can be applied to conflicts in other contexts at later times.

This research involves case studies of four public high school teachers handling and modelling the problem of inclusion in their social studies classrooms. In interpreting and implementing social studies curriculum, teachers represent to their students particular images of citizenship, of leadership, and of the political system in which these are embedded. In "hidden" as well as overt social studies curriculum, students are shown what kinds of people may be social or political actors, and shown what kinds of behaviors are expected of citizens. In subject-matter (implemented curricular content), national and international heroes, villains, and recurring themes serve as models of citizenship expectations. Curriculum may attempt to foster love of country by emphasizing similarity and unanimity, minimizing conflict, or alternatively by emphasizing the wide scope of valued members in the national community, using conflict as a learning opportunity. To present alternate viewpoints is to represent additional people and groups as significant parts of the national community. In pedagogy

(implemented curricular process), the classroom is a laboratory for the practice of citizenship behaviors. If a wide spectrum of student voices are heard in relation to curricular topics, then a wide spectrum of students are both practicing skills for and observing models of inclusion in pluralist democracy.

Conflict in teaching and learning

"Conflict" is "sharp disagreement or opposition, as of interest or ideas" (*Webster's New World Dictionary,* 1988). No other concept captures so well the difficulty (and the beauty) of democracy in a plural and rapidly-changing society: democratic life involves conflict. Conflict implies meaningful disagreement (not only difference) between viewpoints, values, or needs. Conflict may arise from misperception or miscommunication, but just as often it arises from real divergence of interests (Deutch 1973). The central concern of conflict is the existence or acknowledgement of divergent needs or contradictory views, not the means for confronting that divergence: conflict may be confronted in any number of nonviolent or violent ways. In social studies curriculum, both subject-matter content and pedagogical strategies can be designed to emphasize or to minimize conflict.

Conflictual *subject-matter content* in the curriculum presents inclusive images of who "makes history." Teachers may pose problems by introducing controversial material or by including contrasting viewpoints from different cultures, different ideologies, or different sources of information. Differences do not always come into conflict (for example, individuals may have different responses to a piece of art), but conflict can be stimulated by difference (for example, two accounts of an historical event disagree on what really happened and why, or three parties to a situation disagree on how that situation should be changed).

Pedagogical strategies in the curriculum involve a continuum from encouraging to discouraging the face-to-face confrontation of conflicts. Such conflicts may occur spontaneously (due to differences in background, opinion, or needs among students and teachers) or they may be planned aspects of the teacher's agenda. Conflict resolution behavior (including bias awareness and negotiation skills) may also be encouraged (facilitated and/or taught), tolerated (allowed), or discouraged (squelched and/or sent outside the classroom). One of the ways schools reproduce social inequality is by encouraging some students to practice confronting meaningful problems, while at the same time discouraging others from handling critical or conflictual material: for example, "smart" or cooperative or self-confident students who are given challenging material and whose voices are heard in many classrooms are disproportionately male and/or white and/or affluent (e.g. Anyon 1981, Fine 1987, Metz 1978, Sadker & Sadker 1990).

It is possible for a teacher to use conflictual subject-matter without significantly opening the classroom process to conflictual behavior. Likewise, it is possible to encourage diversity and dissent (behavior) in the classroom without significantly changing the subject-matter (content). Pedagogy and subject-matter conflict interact: they are separable in theory, and to some extent in particular teachers' inclinations and skills, but in the realm of implemented curricular practice the two dimensions are intertwined.

The most direct effect of using conflict in teaching is the modelling (representation) of diverse viewpoints and the development of *skills* through practice. This is why conflict in the *process* of teaching is as important as conflict in the *content* covered. A vast amount of social learning takes place through observation and processing of modeled behavior (Bandura 1986, Dawson, Prewitt & Dawson 1977, Sniderman 1975). Teachers are often valued and credible models, in comparison to other adults in a child's life (Ehman 1980, Harwood 1991). To be sure, students are exposed to these issues in the community, media, and so forth, but it is in the classroom that these conflicts may be confronted in the relatively safe, integrated, and systematic ways likely to facilitate development (Eyler 1980). Thus schools, and social studies classes in particular because of their responsibility for democratic socialization, are important sources of political learning. Student learners selectively pay attention to, remember, understand or adapt, and choose to act out the behaviors they witness in the classroom.

For many students, serious conflict and even violence are already everyday occurrences. Normally, school knowledge is divorced from such "real life" conflicts (Fine 1991). It is important that conflict (like any teaching activity) affects different students differently. Some students' experiences with conflict outside of school could make conflictual teaching more relevant and believable (and thus interesting and useful) than consensual approaches. On the other hand, some students who have experienced traumatic conflict might feel too intimidated to benefit from participating in conflictual pedagogy. Other students, who are not well-served by the prevailing structures of schooling and who therefore have frequent trouble with schoolwork, might be left behind by complex (conflictual) material. For example, when some individuals get to speak up and be heard in these conflictual discussions, the speakers practice different skills and "citizenship" roles from the listeners. It is a complex and uncertain endeavor to present conflict (or *any* curriculum) to a broad and diverse group of students.

The work of Piaget and others has shown that young people are not passive receptacles for knowledge (1955, also Berlynne 1969, Liben 1987, Resnick 1987). They are actively involved in the construction of meaning out of their experiences. Two people can be affected differently by the same experience. In Piaget's terms, some information is "assimilated" into a person's understanding fairly easily, when she/he can fit it into a pre-existing schema or conceptual framework. In other cases, an experience does not fit with a person's prior

understanding. In this situation, the conflict may stimulate cognitive "accommodation," that is, a creation or re-structuring of mental avenues for better understanding. Pedagogy involving high levels of conflict has been shown to increase the scope and complexity of students' cognitive schemas (Torney-Purta 1989, 1990).

> From the perspective of Piagetian theory, conflict is an essential component of development. It is the inability of existing cognitive structure to assimilate perturbation -- be they externally or internally induced -- that calls up the cognitively progressive equilibration process. Thus conflict is a critical process for ... informing educational experiences that induce cognitive growth. -- Liben (1987), p.248

Thus the presentation of conflict offers a qualitatively different learning opportunity from the presentation of consensual or simple additive information.

Festinger also suggested that conflict can stimulate thinking (1964). "Cognitive dissonance" is his term for the condition that exists when two ideas or pieces of information do not fit together in someone's mind. For example, a person may be confronted with the logical inconsistency of her/his beliefs, or may find that s/he has behaved contrary to her/his beliefs. According to Festinger, people prefer harmony: they generally try to resolve such dissonance by re-examining or changing their knowledge and beliefs. Thus the examination of contradictory evidence about ideas, or the presentation of alternative explanations for events, can stimulate thinking (and sometimes learning).

The airing or acting out of competing viewpoints in class can provide students with the opportunity to clarify and deepen their knowledge (Smith et.al. 1981, Torney-Purta 1989). Simple quantity of formal social studies education does not necessarily have a net effect on students' political knowledge and attitudes (Ehman 1980, Grossman 1976). Nevertheless, social studies curriculum that uses specific conflicting perspectives as learning opportunities -- by introducing conflictual subject-matter and/or by facilitating conflictual pedagogical processes -- *can* make a difference, at least for the "average" student (Avery 1992, Duggan et.al. 1986, Ehman 1980, Goldenson 1978, Grossman 1976). Thus social studies instruction that increases students' familiarity and practice with the points of view of other groups, nations, and cultures may be able to change students' skills and inclinations for the management of conflict in their democratic society.

Education for citizenship in a conflictual society

Social conflict is inherent to pluralist society. Educators cope with such conflict by balancing the impulse to incorporate and standardize young citizens with the impulse to encourage diversity, creativity, and change. Social studies education can serve to maintain

systems of cultural, structural, and economic dominance, for example by presenting the *status quo* as the natural order or by legitimating the "failure" of some students relative to others. It can also provide access to power and voice in those social systems, for example by opening cracks and interstices for informed dissent or by broadening the skills and confidence that may yield economic opportunity. Public school teachers are expected to tread this tightrope on a daily basis -- to promote consensus values while simultaneously avoiding divisive religious and political issues and teaching critical thinking (Barbagli & Dei 1977). This tension is most visible in the field of social studies, because of the direct association of that subject-matter with democratic citizenship preparation.

The human diversity emerging in U.S. classrooms is not inherently conflictual, but it is often seen as holding the potential for conflict. Difference among students, instead of being approached as a potential source of knowledge and inspiration, is often given as a rationale for building consensus through social studies. One approach to the diversity of school and citizen populations, like that of McNeill and Ravitch, is to emphasize a shared and mythical past -- highlighting the voices of heroes and former leaders to prepare students for unity and stability (also Cunningham 1986, Sewall 1988).

> . . . [M]igrants from Asia, Africa and Latin America have filled our classrooms with students whose ethnic and cultural background is not 'Western.' *They need a past they can share* with Americans of European descent; and equally, Americans of European descent *need a past they can share* with all their fellow citizens. . .
> - William McNeill, in National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools (1989), p.53 (*emphasis added*)

> Wisely and intelligently designed, what has come to be known as the multicultural curriculum is a *tool with which to broaden and transmit the common culture that we all share*. . . It is the job of public education to teach everyone, whatever their ancestry, that we are all Americans and *we all reside in the same world.* - Ravitch (1990), p.18 *(emphasis added)*

A contrasting approach to diversity, like that of Banks, is to emphasize the speed and scope of change in the nation and the world -- highlighting multiple (and sometimes challenging) new voices to prepare students for social progress and redress of inequalities (also Becker 1990, Belenky et.al. 1986, Boulding 1988, Crichlow et.al.1991, Engle & Ochoa 1988, Ladson-Billings 1992, Giroux 1988, Horton & Freire 1990, Merelman 1990, Sigel 1990, Tucker 1990, Wallerstein 1987). The latter view emphasizes conflict and change.

> Our goal should not be merely to educate students of color or white mainstream students to fit into the existing workforce, social structure, and society. Such an education would be inimical to students from different cultural groups because it would force them to experience self-alienation. It would fail to incorporate their voices, experiences, and perspectives. . . To develop a clarified national identity

> and commitment to the nation, groups and individuals must feel that they are integral parts of the nation and national culture. - Banks (1990), p.211

There have been movements to reform social education curriculum, reflecting recurring conflicts over values in the larger society, for about as long as there has been public education (Cuban 1990). Notable among such movements for change in recent years have been those promoting multicultural, peace/conflict, and global/international education (e.g. AEGIS et.al. 1989, Anderson 1979, Banks 1990, Brock-Utne 1989, Kirkwood 1991, Lamy 1983, McCarthy 1988, Nelson-Barber & Meier 1990, Nieto 1991, Reardon 1982, 1990, Simonton & Walker 1988, Sleeter 1991, Tye 1991, Wein 1987). The dismal state of U.S. citizens' knowledge about either the rest of the world or the non-dominant cultures in our midst has been well documented (e.g. Jencks 1985, Joy 1990, Short 1985, Torney 1977, Westholm et.al. 1990). For example, citizens and schoolchildren seem to discover the existence of small countries and unfamiliar cultures only when political debate erupts over U.S. military involvement.

> Education for democratic citizenship in a global age calls for a new look at our past and a greater concern for our future. ... Narrow nationalism, dogmatic ideologies, and an endangered environment are luxuries humans can no longer afford. - Becker (1990), p.70

> Broadly conceived, multicultural education expresses a desire to have the school experience closely reflect those realities of pluralism and cultural diversity which exist within the society itself. - Crichlow et.al. (1990), p.101

It is commonly suggested that teaching young people about the ideologically and ethnically diverse roots and branches of their society will help to make them feel included and to inspire visions of diverse possibility (e.g. Anyon 1979, Kelly & Nihlen 1982, Kirp 1991, Nelson-Barber & Meier 1990, Spender & Sarah 1988, Trecker 1974). This is not the place for a review of the important work that has been done in multicultural education, but it is important to note that a common thread in this diverse work has been the importance of bringing conflicting perspectives to bear on new notions of citizenship and citizenship education.

To name, rather than to silence, conflicts in the social studies curriculum (and, by implication, in the society being studied) may seem risky but it holds the potential for stimulating inclusive learning, by fitting with the lived experiences of students.

> Enormous energy must be required to sustain beliefs in equal opportunity and the color-blind power of credentials, and to silence nagging losses of faith when evidence to the contrary compels on a daily basis. Naming in such a case would only unmask, fundamentally disrupting or contradicting one's belief system. . . To not name bears consequences for all students, but more so for low-income, minority youths. To not name is to systematically alienate, [to] cut off from home,

> from heritage and from lived experience, and ultimately to sever from their educational process. - Fine (1987), p.160-161.

Representing the society as inclusive to students has broad implications beyond simple self-esteem or feelings of membership, important as these may be. Naming contradictions, bringing conflict into the open, is able to disrupt belief systems – it stimulates the mental activity described by Piaget, Festinger, and others as leading to learning.

Students who have lived through violence or exclusion may be exceptionally aware and skilled at this kind of expanded thinking, when such topics are put on the academic agenda. After all, they have had practice dealing with conflict (Merelman 1990).

> Those who are pushed out of the tribe for being different are likely to become more sensitized (when not brutalized into insensitivity). Those who do not feel psychologically or physically safe in the world are more apt to develop this sense. Those who are pounced on the most have it the strongest -- the females, the homosexuals of all races, the dark skinned, the outcast, the persecuted, the marginalized, the foreign... It's a kind of survival tactic that people, caught between the worlds, unknowingly cultivate.
> - Anzaldúa (1987), pp.38-39.

Young people who have been marginalized have already practiced juggling their own points of view in a realm of different and dominant viewpoints. To bring this expertise into the school curriculum is to provide all students with an opportunity to learn, and to provide especially challenged students with an opportunity to excel.

The groundswell of work in the area of critical pedagogy offers a way of understanding the relationship between the content of curriculum and the processes of replicating or contradicting social inequalities (e.g. Cornbleth 1990, Ellsworth 1988, Giroux 1988, Lather 1986, Shor 1986, Wallerstein 1987). The focus of this work is on the confrontation of social conflicts, as these are manifested interpersonally in the classroom.

> By focusing upon contradictions and conflict, radical interpretations of social life can offer students the resources to reflect upon important problems that conventional teaching tends to avoid... Rather than viewing the teacher as a dispenser of truth and the student as a receptor who accumulates knowledge for future use, both are seen as participating in a search, the success of which requires mutual adaptation to the other's social constructs; each must learn to suspend one's views sufficiently to allow the other's to penetrate. -- Newmann (1985), p.7-8

In his discussion of critical pedagogy, Newmann emphasizes the utility of conflict in both the content and the process of social studies curriculum, reinforcing the idea that a critical

perspective implies a different (more dynamic) view of knowledge from the traditional transmission approach to social studies.

The paradox of democratic education is that the two needs and tendencies traced above -- one toward stability and the other toward change -- exist simultaneously. As Cuban points out, they are not dichotomous issues that can be won, lost, or solved by miracles; "they are dilemmas that require political negotiation and compromises," and they are balanced somewhat differently on the tightrope of each teacher's curriculum (1990, p.8). Educators' management of this dilemma is deeply rooted in their understandings and representations of social studies "knowledge" (Berlak and Berlak, 1981). On one hand, knowledge may be seen as static *content* to be mastered, like the "past" that McNeill and Ravitch see as shared and true (thus unchangeable). This view minimizes conflict. On the other hand, knowledge may be seen as a dynamic *process* in which to participate, changed by the multiple "voices, experiences, and perspectives" that Banks sees as integral to the national culture. In the latter view, knowledge is constructed out of specific social and temporal locations; it can be challenged and reconstructed to fit new realities. This view recognizes the potential of conflict as a learning opportunity. The complex daily behavior of teachers falls somewhere between these two extremes, and carries contradictory elements of both. The current research project "unpacks" this bundle of contradictions, by identifying and getting to know particular teachers who exemplify different responses to this dilemma, and by observing the interactions of various kinds of students with the different implemented social studies curricula shaped by those decisions.

Social studies curriculum: human drama expunged of conflict?

In spite of conflict's potential value for learning, U.S. social studies curriculum commonly avoids conflict. Texts and teaching resources present a bland, consensus-oriented view of political, economic, and historical processes (Anyon 1979). The origins of ideas are rarely specified, much less owned by the authors themselves. Instead, actions are attributed to an undefined "we." For example, the authors of a typical high school social studies text, *American Government in Action*, described conflict avoidance in their writing process.

> Of course we both have private prejudices... but we made a scrupulous effort to hide them from our readers, if only because no one would buy the book if we didn't.
>
> -- Resnick & Nierenberg, in Novak et.al: (1978) p.44

The conventional wisdom is to provide different perspectives, but to hide the authors' "prejudices" by restricting those viewpoints to a narrow range and by using passive voice and/or past tense to deal with conflictual information (Anyon 1979). No view (or only one) is

developed thoroughly enough that a student might consider it seriously as a point of view regarding a contestable truth. Thus social studies knowledge is presented as static, neutral, and purged of conflict -- passively supporting the *status quo* rather than representing the more complicated plural society in which students actually live.

Who and what defines the central political "we" presented in schools and especially in the social studies curriculum? In recent decades, a body of research has accused the school system of reproducing and legitimating the social hierarchy, protecting the privileged position of economic and cultural elites (e.g. Apple 1979, Barbagli & Dei 1977, Bourdieu & Passeron 1977, Bowles & Gintis 1986, Carnoy & Levin 1985, Delpit 1988).

> Silencing... more intimately informs low-income, public schooling than relatively privileged situations. To question from above holds intellectual promise; to question from below forebodes danger. In low-income schools both the process of inquiry into students' lived experience, and the content to be unearthed, are assumed to be, a priori, unsafe territory -Fine (1987), p.158

According to Fine, schools reinforce different attitudes and behaviors for children from different backgrounds, by teaching a "hidden curriculum" of supposed political consensus and passivity, and by operating with unchallenged language and values which are well-understood and comfortable for some (elites) and foreign to others (also Anyon 1981).

Gender inequity, for example, is a social hierarchy that is maintained partially through schooling. There are two problems: "(1) the male monopolization of culture and knowledge; and (2) the sexual politics of everyday life in schools" (Acker 1987 p.429). The cultural and knowledge problem is reminiscent of Bourdieu's analysis about social class. In terms of culture and knowledge, the language, illustrations, humor, and topics used in the classroom describe the life of "men" (Belenky et.al. 1986, Gilligan 1982, Harwood & Hahn 1992, Sigel 1990, Trecker 1974). The term men does not genuinely serve as a generic: the stories, models and heroes, and sources of information in social studies curriculum are nearly all from or about males. The prescribed ways of looking at those stories give precedence to abstract, individualist, and rule-oriented (masculine) ways of shaping and interpreting knowledge, rather than to contextual and relational (feminine) ways of knowing. In daily classroom life, boys receive a disproportionate amount of the scarcest commodity in classrooms -- the teacher's time and attention (Kelly & Nihlen 1982, Sadker & Sadker 1988?, Spender & Sarah 1988). Even though they are socialized *together*, girls and boys are socialized *differently* in school classrooms. Such inequity is not uniform or deterministic across contexts, of course, but it helps to maintain the social hierarchy.

Students commonly encounter not only conventional textbooks, but also conventional pedagogy. Only about one fifth of the social studies teachers Ehman interviewed mentioned

teaching goals "which could, using generous definitions, be allocated into the critical thinking and value analysis modes" (1970). The social studies teachers studied by Goodlad (fifteen years later when critical thinking had received more media attention) said they *intended* to develop students' ability to reason, but he found that they *actually* tested and rewarded something else: the memorization of endless names, dates, and slogans (1985). Official curricular goals emphasize critical thinking (and thus conflict) – but the context, training, and daily demands with which social studies teachers work create an entirely different effect at the level of implemented curriculum. Many students learn to tune out this kind of fragmented and conflict-sanitized information.

> By the time they are in their latter years of high school, students appear to be remarkably resilient to what must be termed conventional modes of teaching and teacher behavior. - Ehman (1970), p.227

Grossman affirmed Ehman's demonstration of students' resilience to ordinary social studies (1976). He showed no association between the number of high school social studies courses a student had taken and teacher-valued outcomes such as tolerance for dissent. The few courses that were explicitly devoted to *controversial* issues, however, did correlate with both students' interest in social studies and their tolerance for dissent (also McNeil 1980, 1986). Avery and her colleagues constructed curriculum to facilitate students' direct application of democratic principles to conflicts with specific unpopular groups (using conflict in curricular process as well as content), and demonstrated that such curriculum would increase students' political tolerance (1992, also Goldenson 1978). Thus social studies curriculum that makes constructive use of conflict is not common, but it *can* exist, and courses that do use conflict have been shown to be more effective in educating the average student.

Beyond the constraints of the larger social and political context, individual teachers' tendency to rely on simpler lecture and textbook-centered methods, rather than inclusive conflict, is easy to explain. First, their "apprenticeship of observation" goes on for sixteen or more years. That is, teachers spend many years as students, observing models of teaching, mostly in conventional classrooms (Lortie 1975). Furthermore, once they are working for a school system, teachers are isolated in a complex, uncertain, and demanding environment (Jackson 1968). Teachers are constrained to varying degrees by school-level administrative expectations to emphasize efficiency, decorum, and achievement test scores (Apple 1979, Caulfield 1990, Feiman-Nemser & Floden 1986, Giroux 1988, McNeil 1986, Swidler 1979). Desegregated and de-tracked classes, such as social studies, can expect to have more within-classroom conflict than other classes, because of their greater diversity of student interests and needs. To cope, students and teachers quickly learn the norms of deference, obedience, and

avoidance of conflict. "In schools, as in prisons, good behavior pays off" (Jackson 1968 p.34). Practicing conflict can motivate thought and change, but there are compelling institutional reasons for its rarity.

Teachers who encourage behavioral or substantive conflict to teach students thinking skills give up some control and predictability, risking trouble and embarrassment. McNeil described the frequent practice of what she called "defensive teaching" in several high school social studies classrooms (1986). Teachers deliberately simplified curricular content and lowered their demands on students, in exchange for classroom order and (minimal) compliance. They fragmented and simplified information into bits and lists, thereby eliminating relationships, complexity, and conflictual messages. Other points of view, historical actors, and time periods (such as the present, on which "historians do not yet agree") were simply omitted.

> [A world studies course] raced around the globe... In this sweeping survey, students picked up the message that one does not need more than superficial knowledge about these other countries; the U.S. is the 'best' able to deal with all the diversity and conflict. 'Our' customs are normal; 'theirs' are strange. ... The message of social studies content in the most controlling of these classes is that the system can be trusted, it does not need to be questioned, it does not need our active involvement. The classroom rewards for passive student roles have confirmed the value of acquiescence. - McNeil (1986), p.196, 208

The foregoing body of work captures the synthesis of substantive conflict with pedagogical and behavioral conflict in social studies curriculum: in order to avoid the control risks associated with conflictual behavior, teachers often eliminate conflictual materials, processes, and demands from the implemented curriculum. Constructive confrontation of conflict provides an unusually good opportunity to learn, but the social structure of mass schooling is more likely to model and reward the submersion of conflict. Social studies teachers manage this dilemma in a variety of ways: the similarities among their approaches shed light on the constraints of the social system, while the contrasts among them shed light on the possibilities for improving social studies education to better promote inclusion of diverse new citizens in the dynamic processes of modern democracy.

Research on social and political learning has had its limitations. Very little work has studied non-dominant gender or ethnic groups, even though this variable has repeatedly proven to be an important correlate of socialization outcomes. Boys and white students consistently scored differently on knowledge and attitude tests than girls and non-whites, for example: this is evidence that being socialized *together* in a classroom does not guarantee being socialized *the same*. The use of analysis limited to central tendencies of scores on paper-and-pencil tests obscured meaningful differences among the experiences of either students or

their teachers, as well as the reasons for those differences. School factors were not (or could not be) pinned down with enough specificity to describe preferable teacher behaviors or curricular reforms. Furthermore, important *skill* development outcomes, because they are more difficult than knowledge and attitudes to measure with multiple-choice tests, have been disproportionately ignored.

General statements about the average effects of social studies education mask an important problem: confronting controversial (conflictual) material could help some students while hindering others. For example, some discussion formats could cause some students to be silenced by the complex or frightening topic, the unpredictable and public process, or the judgmental attitudes of their adolescent peers (Avery 1988, Delpit 1988, Fine 1987, Metz 1978, Rose 1989). This is an important challenge because pluralist democracy requires authentic inclusion of less-powerful citizens: if public school does not provide *all* young citizens with encouragement and practice in having a voice in the context of social conflict, then what or who will? In-depth case study research compliments the research cited above by helping to fill these gaps in the knowledge base from which social studies curriculum is constructed.

New research: contrasting case studies in multiethnic school settings

Citizenship education has special importance for non-majority, non-dominant students, because these individuals are less likely to have opportunities to observe and practice political influence outside of school, compared to children of majority and dominant social groups. Urban public institutions, whose mandate includes the incorporation of diverse new citizens, are a logical place to consider social studies curriculum as a reflection of societal and educational objectives. Also, some kinds of conflict, especially in heterogeneous situations, can at times *impede* learning; in order to show conflict as a realistic learning opportunity, case studies must show conflict operating in the "real world" of challenged/changing public schools. Therefore all of these cases are located in public classrooms populated by ethnically and economically diverse students, including new immigrants. In these social locations, inclusion in empowered citizenship is a highly relevant concern.

I was a participant observer for most of one school year, several hours each per week, in four public high school classrooms in two economically and ethnically diverse districts in the San Francisco Bay Area. I sat in a desk like those of the students, who mainly ignored me since I had no role in directing or evaluating their work. My intention was to observe contrasting versions of implemented social studies curriculum in their living form -- including students' as well as teachers' words and deeds, rather than focusing on (more accessible but less operationally accurate) plans or materials. Interviews with teachers, usually after class, were

informal and unstructured and were intended to supplement observations by giving teachers an opportunity to explain and reflect on their implemented curricula.

I was fortunate to find four committed, intelligent and experienced teachers who allowed me to observe their classes and to talk with them about their work. They were chosen to reflect substantial natural variation in the ways they did (and didn't) use conflict as a learning opportunity in teaching social studies. Ken Jacobs' teaching generally avoids conflict in either curricular substance or pedagogical process, by focusing on independent seatwork involving simple manipulation and reporting of information from text pages and films. Tom Clark, in the same school as Ken, uses both pedagogical conflict (for example, bringing in conflictual issues for open discussion) and curricular conflict (for example, requiring analysis of opposing points of view on particular curricular subjects). Sarah Gilbert's pedagogy is built around simple curricular content coupled with a very open climate of conflictual discussion. Ruth Murray, in the same district as Sarah, builds her curriculum around the presentation of conflictual information (especially multicultural and international perspectives) by means of tightly teacher-controlled pedagogical strategies. In every case, teachers were presenting standard courses that are required for high school graduation. Both U.S. History teachers used the same textbook; neither World Studies teacher relied generally on a textbook.

In summary, the rough dimensions of contrast between the teacher subjects chosen for these case studies are as follows:

		SUBJECT-MATTER CONTENT	
		(less conflict)	(more conflict)
PEDAGOGY PROCESS	(less conflict)	KEN	RUTH
	(more conflict)	SARAH	TOM

A thorough discussion of my research method is included in the appendix. The questions with which I approached the case studies were as follows:

(1) How did these urban high school teachers use (and avoid using) conflict in the curricular content and/or the pedagogical manner in which they presented social studies? How did conflict shape their representations of key social studies (citizenship) ideas?

(2) What did various students practice doing in these social studies classroom "laboratories," and how might this behavior model inclusion or exclusion in the larger political society? Is conflictual curriculum more intrinsically engaging for some students, and/or does it contribute to the silencing of some students?

This paper concentrates on the citizenship education of subordinate groups in high school social studies. There are two dimensions of this problem -- "learning inclusion" and "inclusion in learning." First and most obvious, I sought to replicate and extend existing research on *learning inclusion*, i.e. representations of "others." It is well-known that textbooks and audio-visual materials tend to be ethnocentric and narrow in their depictions of non-dominant ethnic and cultural groups (e.g. Anyon 1979, Ellsworth 1991, Ladson-Billings 1992): did the teachers soften that blow to inclusion in their implemented curricula by adding to or interrogating the prepared materials? The second dimension was harder to study reliably, but a richer addition to citizenship education knowledge. Multicultural education research, in particular, points out that the faces of "others" may be added to curriculum while their "otherness" (contrasting or challenging viewpoints) are still steadfastly ignored (e.g. Banks 1988). *Inclusion in learning* involves representation and face-to-face confrontation of of conflicting ideologies or viewpoints: how did the teachers represent the pluralist aspect of society, the existence and importance of dissent and debate? Not least, how did the teachers actually practice the inclusion of various student voices in the laboratory of classroom discourse? The following section concentrates on the content dimension of conflict's place in citizenship education. The four teachers -- Ruth, Sarah, Tom, and Ken -- varied in their curricular presentations of international and multicultural material and perspectives.

Ruth: World Studies as cross-cultural "literacy"

A. Learning inclusion:

Ruth Murray taught the concept of culture systematically, as a concept to be understood, in her ninth grade World Studies course (East H.S.). The class read a short definitional piece for homework, and then reviewed it in class, led by Ruth using the overhead projector. They listed "the five characteristics of culture" around which Ruth had organized the article, giving examples of each characteristic (culture is learned, involves behavior accepted as normal by other members of the society, etc). For example Ruth prompted, "Where does one sex go around all covered up?" Students made various guesses, including India; Ruth said no until somebody guessed "Arabia" and "Middle East." The teacher then pointed out that this behavior had to do with religion, which is cultural (9/21).

The same day, Ruth assigned groups of 2-4 students to apply their new knowledge, by deciding which items on a printed list reflected "culture," and which were "inherited." She encouraged students to identify disagreements and to defend their own responses. Within a few minutes, students were back in the large group and each item had been resolved into one correct answer. The teacher explained the items on which students still disagreed, writing them

on the overhead screen for students to copy into their notes (9/21). The next day, the class took a true-false quiz on this material. For example, these were all "true:"

- If I look at a person I can see some of his culture.
- Culture allows people to live together comfortably.
- Eating with a knife, fork and spoon is the American way to eat and is the right way for Americans to eat. (--9/22)

This quiz took about seven minutes, plus two minutes of going over the answers in the large group. The juxtaposition of true and false answers suggested that it is not acceptable to believe the "American way" to be the only acceptable way of doing things. Yet this quiz and other activities also suggested internal consensus, implying that there is one identifiable "American culture" with preferable ways of behaving.

The end of the same class period (also other days, e.g. 10/24) was taken up with what Ruth called a "Culture Quiz." This was not graded; Ruth read aloud the questions from a trivia book. She told the students, with her eyes twinkling to show that she was teasing:

> How many of you are culturally normal? Let's see who's normal. Remember you're not adults: normal for you may be four or five [correct answers]... These are all things you would pick up from your culture if you've been alive. You may be culturally deprived...
> - What is the first day of Lent?
> - How many members are there in the U.S. Senate?
> - What do Spanish Americans mean by 'gringo'?
> - What is the main vegetable in cole slaw? (-- 9/22 period 2)

Even though this activity was conducted in a spirit of fun, one wonders what a student who did poorly on it, for example one of the several recent immigrants in the class, might have felt. Can United States culture be defined in terms of "normal" mainstream knowledge?

Ruth Murray's curriculum was tightly-structured and information-oriented. She went on after the culture unit to deal with the concept of race. She told her class that race is not the same as culture and that the idea "is mis-used a great deal" (9/28 period 1). In her usual tightly-structured fashion, Ruth led students to fill out a chart on the "traits of the three major races." First she clarified that "major" here only refers to larger numbers not to superiority and that there is considerable diversity within each racial group. Whites (Caucasoids) aren't really white in color, yellows (Mongoloids) aren't really yellow, and blacks (Negroids) aren't really black, Ruth told the class. The chart listed skin and eye colors, nose and eye shapes, hair color and texture, and height considered normal for each of the three groups.

Ruth pointed out similarities and differences among members within each racial category by pointing to specific members of the class. This caused considerable squirming and giggling. One student of Asian origin objected strenuously, *"I'm* not Mongoloid!" (apparently

associating the term with Down's syndrome, although this was not verbalized). Ruth persisted in treating the matter as neutral information, saying only, "This is not funny." The issue of prejudice was handled by means of the films *Eye of the Storm* (about the blue-eyed, brown-eyed experiment led by a teacher in Iowa) and *They* (an allegory about in-groups and point of view). Students' essays about this material indicated that most had understood the personal level issues regarding self esteem but few had grasped the idea of power or privilege (notes 10/3).

Ruth's next unit was about the geography and politics of Latin America. In keeping with her general strategy, she introduced systematically into her lessons content information that included diverse points of view (hence potential conflicts). For example, she assigned reading about the different ethnic groups in Latin America (10/17-19). In some detail, she introduced the economic concept of social class. Her lessons described and contrasted the class structures of Latin America and the United States (10/24). She used a filmstrip and stories to represent examples of different teenagers' and families' lives at different economic locations in Latin America (10/25,26,30).

In most class sessions, Ruth used a drill format, asking fifteen or more convergent vocabulary or informational questions in which students volunteered correct or incorrect answers. She asked a few divergent questions, not eliciting feelings or opinions but asking for examples of the phenomena on her agenda. Her control of classroom discourse was remarkable: nearly everything said in class seemed to fit into a clear framework of instructional objectives. Thus it was rare that students' feelings, including their acceptance or rejection of other human ways of life, were given voice in the classroom. One counter-example provides a sense of what some students might have been thinking:

> In the introduction to economics lesson early in the Latin America unit, Ruth led the class to apply what they knew about class structures in this country to the context of Latin America. After drilling the class on definitions of terms, she asked the class for examples of upper- and then lower-class residences in this country. Joanna volunteered, laughing, "The street corner - bums!" A few other students chuckled. The teacher replied, "Not just bums, but we have a whole new class of people living on the street now - the homeless." Then she changed the subject, eliciting examples of lower-class residences in Latin America.
> (-- 10/24 period 2)

Ruth's World Studies curriculum covered considerable content and vocabulary information about race and culture, using the disciplinary constructs of sociology and anthropology. Her "religions of the world" unit (situated within a Middle East unit) was presented with a chart contrasting Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Principal beliefs were listed in the bottom row of boxes, preceded by ten other categories of information:

Century in which it started
Other names by which followers are known
Name of its founder
Name of its God
Holy Book
Day & worship
Place of worship
Holy city
Area of the world it is most prominent
Major festivals and holidays (--12/14)

The next day's reading assignment used "some rules generally observed by Saudi Arabians" to raise the question, "Where do laws come from?" Examples given included: 80 lashes are given for intoxication (40 lashes if the drinker is a slave); thieves have their hands cut off; women are [considered] inferior to men and must wear veils; eating should be with the right hand and the shoes off. Students were instructed to read this list (of presumably unfamiliar practices -- stereotypes about Arab culture?) and to list a problem that might have been solved by each rule. The handout's directions explain, using a passive voice that minimizes any notion of social conflict:

> ... societies discover that a certain way of acting causes problems. To avoid that problem, a rule is made up which prohibits the way of acting. The rule may come from an authority and be written down, or it may simply become accepted over a long period of time. The actual procedure isn't important. It's more important to know that rules usually begin as practical solutions to real problems. (--12/15)

Ruth Murray was conscientious and consistent about embedding in her World Studies lessons the idea that human history includes groups with opposing interests and different viewpoints. This was not based on exhortations to view material in particular ways, but rather on the structured presentation of factual information about non-dominant as well as dominant groups. Her students did not often practice responding to cultural or ideological differences inside the classroom. When students did voice opinions about these potential or actual human conflicts, the spirit of inclusion underlying the curricular content was not necessarily reflected in their expressed understandings.

B. Inclusion in learning:

In December, I gave each teacher a written summary of what I had seen and interpreted in observing their classes thus far, and discussed it with them (see appendix). In Ruth Murray's case, this feedback and discussion may have had an exceptionally strong impact on her curricular strategies during the remainder of the same (Middle East) unit, resumed after the winter vacation. Ruth told me that she hadn't realized just how little class time she had been allocating for discussion or critical thinking regarding course material.

> I think discussion requires a depth of knowledge on the students' part... I'm torn between having a discussion and giving them enough knowledge... I think kids feel very frustrated in discussion groups, unless I structure it: find this, now find this. [Why?] Because they don't know what they're talking about. I'm torn: should I be teaching the content, the history, or should I be letting them deal with feelings? I need to do the content *first*, so I don't get much time for the second. (Ruth, 1/5/90 interview).

I observed an activity in Ruth's two subsequent classes that was extraordinarily different from anything else I had observed before, especially in Ruth's classes. I reproduce here an abridged version of the notes I scribbled right after class, because (despite the poor language use of an excited researcher) they expose quite clearly the ways I was thinking about the evidence I gathered in these case studies:

> 1/9/91: Today was striking, worth (it seems) a thousand other classroom observations. When I suddenly see *'real' conflict* (voices raised, faces animated, a chorus of 'Yeah, but' and 'No!' and 'Wait!', a *depth* of engagement in which nothing else is apparently going on in participants' minds...), it makes me wonder whether I should be calling the other stuff (different opinions or viewpoints expressed quietly and without emotion: *cognitive* exercises) 'conflict' at all. There was a *marked* difference between today's 'real' conflict -- a debate in which the class was physically organized on 'sides' of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and directed to express any and all opinions *to each other* -- and yesterday's teacher-directed 'perspective-identification' exercise.
>
> *Yesterday*, students read two dramatized views ... [of 'David,' a fictional Israeli Jew, and 'Daud,' a fictional Palestinian Arab, about their rights to the homeland] ... Then [students independently] wrote out the arguments given by one side... [Student volunteers gave] examples of these arguments for the teacher to record on the overhead transparency screen, taking one view at a time. [By the end of class, the two viewpoints were side by side on the screen, but there was no discussion or even direct (verbal) comparison of the ideas.]
>
> *Today*, [Ruth] introduced the activity by defining the word 'controversy' and encouraging the taking of positions and stating of arguments. Students' desks were set up in a debate structure, facing one another along three sides of the room... Each student chose her/his position (pro-Israeli, pro-Palestinian, or undecided) and was instructed to physically move to one of the other sections of the room if/when they changed their opinion... [Here is an amazing "natural experiment" regarding the potential for conflict to stimulate cognitive change!] [Students'] voices were loud and emotional; arguments were essentially shouted at the other side; most students who participated spoke several times. Instead of their usual... monosyllabic responses to convergent teacher questions, students spoke in whole sentences (or two; usually under a minute per speech), *explaining* and *defending* their opinions with evident energy (1/9/91).

This incident lends support to the argument that conflict is inherently interesting *and* that it motivates thought/cognitive change. Here is some evidence for this inference:

1. Several students *gave detailed reasons* for their opinions, *responding directly* to objections from the other side by *clarifying* and *elaborating* their own arguments. When they did this, their voices usually went up in (emotional) pitch, indicating that they were *responding* to their 'opponents' by identifying with and deepening their viewpoints (in a way that other pedagogies would not have encouraged them to do).

2. Several students (at least 6 of the 30 in period 1 and at least 8 of the 28 in period 2) *changed their viewpoints* (and their physical positions, as instructed) during the debate. Most notably, the number who were *willing/able to take a position* increased dramatically in both classes. The total number sitting on the 'undecided' side dropped from 14 to 10 in period 1, even though someone on the 'Israeli' side changed *to* 'undecided' (and the size of the 'Palestinian' delegation doubled, from 3 to 6). The total number 'undecided' dropped from 7 to 2 in period 2, while others also changed sides entirely (and the 'Palestinian' delegation grew from 7 to 10).

3. Assuming that students learn by doing, there must have been substantial learning because more students participated, more frequently and more extensively (number, length, and quality of responses) in this controversy/debate exercise than in any other activity I witnessed in this class. In period 1 on this day of the debate, 21 of the 30 students spoke (publicly, on the topic, to the whole class -- in both classes some additional students talked on the topic but privately to a neighbor), most of them repeatedly and at length, as compared to 15 out of 29 yesterday (a typical day – at most students gave one or two short answers to convergent questions). The quantity and atmosphere of student involvement in this learning activity, compared to other activities in the same class, was as different as morning is from midnight. How much of the difference was due to the interesting conflictual topics, and how much was due to the 'opportunity to learn' provided by the pedagogical strategies in which students had the floor?

Some evidence regarding this 'content or process' question was provided by another natural experiment that fell into my lucky lap the same day (1/9): a substitute teacher, Mr. X, took over the second period class after the first 20 minutes of the 50-minute period, when Ms. Murray had to leave for an appointment. Normally, period 2 students participated similarly but *more* (and more *of* the students) than the period 1 students. In period 2 on this day, 18 of the 28 students spoke publicly, also repeatedly and at length, *even though* the substitute teacher, unlike Ruth who had stood back and watched, took up about half of the total air time while he was present. The (typical) day before in period 2, only 9 of 26 students spoke even one word to the teacher or to the class. On the debate day, students entered into the discussion readily at

the beginning of class, with no one student capturing the floor and no audible put-downs. When Mr. X came in and began participating, however, many students were literally silenced (even though this teacher would not be grading them in any way). Mr. X frequently (almost constantly, it seemed) out-shouted the loudest students, interrupting to guide the substantive focus of discussion or to direct the process. His interventions were instructive, and they were said with smiles. Nevertheless, many students (including some who normally do speak in this class) never got a word in or were cut off before finishing their points (e.g. giving their reasons). Less-confident students simply stopped talking at all after Mr. X got involved in the lesson.

This incident shows that conflict alone -- even pedagogy that explicitly encourages active participation, multiple viewpoints or perspective identification -- is not enough to stimulate extraordinary student participation and critical thought. In addition, students need real opportunities to participate. This inclusion in learning must require different strategies for different students -- for some confident students, just the open-ended and interesting task was enough to include them. Some other students, who were much more active in this debate than in ordinary lessons. apparently needed space on the "floor" in which they could be heard without direct teacher intervention or evaluation. A full third of the students in both of these class sections, however, never spoke at all: whatever might be required to include them in learning (in this case, practicing having a public voice) never took place in the months I observed their class.

Ruth Murray laid a basis for her students' future participation in pluralist society by broadening considerably her students' exposure to detailed information about unfamiliar people, places, and cultures. On the other hand, her students did not practice, in the classroom, the *skills* associated with democratic participation. Ruth's students almost never publicly evaluated or responded to course material (i.e. aloud during class time): the curriculum maintained some distance from the conflicts that these ideas generate in human life. The message that the "actual procedure [of making such decisions] isn't important" seemed to permeate Ruth's lessons.

Sarah: World Studies as cross-cultural encounter and bias awareness

A. Learning inclusion

In Sarah Gilbert's ninth grade World Studies class at West H.S., in the same district as Ruth (with the same official curriculum), students were invited to experience first-hand some of their own feelings and prejudices about cultures and ideologies different from their own. Sarah did not structure many lessons with vocabulary or specific social science concepts, although she sometimes used those to initiate a discussion topic. For example, she presented current news

material about the Dalai Lama of Tibet in a journalism unit (10/10-23), and films and text on Japanese culture in an area studies unit (2/22-3/30), as instances of ways in which specific "other" people see the world. She invited her students to respond with their feelings and opinions about the unfamiliar belief systems they encountered in the World Studies curriculum. She tried, with mixed success, to keep those responses within bounds of respect for different cultures or beliefs. For example, in the unit on Japan, she explained to her class:

> We're talking about people who *do not see the world as we see it.* They are not us... Japan is oriented toward group identity, and family. Here in the U.S. we are [more] individualistic. (-- 3/20 period 4)

Sarah framed her representations of the world in terms of a "global village." The global village theme was introduced first as a metaphor for environmental and resource interdependence. The course began with the local context -- the theme of the U.S. as a nation of immigrants and made up of diverse regions -- and then widened to include additional parts of the world and various approaches to studying it. As Sarah's curriculum moved from thematic units on journalism, political science, and economics into area studies, she wove the global village motif in and out of each topic. The central theme of Sarah's lessons on culture was respect for difference. The breadth of social science information she presented about human differences or similarities was limited by the time spent on whole class discussion, processing and responding to that information.

Sarah used current events to illustrate world studies concepts, with the explicit intention of inviting students' involvement, questions, and opinions on the material. For example, the unit on 'Political Systems around the World' used recent events in Romania to explain the characteristics of dictatorship (1/3 periods 4&5). The responses of Romanian citizens to the dictatorship, now that it had been overthrown and information was available, were analyzed collectively. More significantly, students were invited to take the perspectives of Romanians: "Think about the execution of Ceaucescu from a Romanian perspective," Ms. Gilbert asked. "How would you feel?" She used about ten convergent questions in each class to clarity information and check understanding, and then spent the bulk of each period soliciting and responding to student-initiated questions or comments about the material. To generate more student response that day, she used a straw vote: "How many approve?... How many disapprove?... How many don't care?" Students who took each position were then asked to explain the reasons for their opinions, while the teacher reiterated affirmations that each person had a valid opinion. Ground rules in Sarah's classes focused on being involved, initiating ideas, and listening respectfully to others.

Sarah introduced unfamiliar viewpoints in her curriculum, and also taught ways of understanding and managing that unfamiliarity. Beginning her unit on Japan, for example, Sarah had students identify and list their feelings of discomfort or rejection about Japanese practices, and then taught them what she called a "culture chant." Her expressed purpose in using this activity was not only to model inclusion, but also to assert and to apply to specific cases the *right* to be different. When somebody said for example, "Eeeuw! That's weird," the class was instructed to add (speaking in unison): "...but I was raised in a different culture and learned to like different things" (2/22). This did not seem to have the effect of squelching dissent, judging from the number of students who disagreed publicly with the teacher in class. One day, for example, a student asserted that his own way of life was superior to the culture they were studying. Sarah disagreed directly, but at the same time let the young man and his peers have their say for about fifteen minutes:

> Vince - The question is, which way of life is better -- the American way, or the Japanese way.
> Ms. Gilbert - No! Why can't we just agree that the two ways are *different*, not better or worse?
> Vince re-asserts his position, and several students join on both sides of the discussion. Four boys and a girl openly challenge the teacher's position that U.S. culture should not necessarily be considered superior, and a comparable number defend her view. I notice that several usually-reluctant students look up and are listening intently; silent Jon actually lifts his drooping head and makes an on-topic comment to his neighbors. For about three minutes there are many voices at once, then the discussion wraps up at a calmer pace. (-- 3/20 period 4)

As if the world were a small village, Sarah asked students to confront specific cultural differences as well as bio-environmental challenges with their feelings as well as their minds. There were a few students -- in this class particularly the students who rarely completed coursework and were receiving low grades -- who *only* spoke up or appeared interested when opposing viewpoints were consequently aired. Lessons moved back and forth from maps and written material to stories about the people and ways of life in particular locations. Because these personal encounters could not actually take place face-to-face, Sarah brought in films and stories. She told me, "I think it's a lot better to show them a film [or an article] with some real people in it than to give them a lecture [about names or dates]" (2/20 interview).

B. Inclusion in learning

Sarah Gilbert typically led at least part of each lesson with divergent, open-ended questions eliciting student opinions and experiences. Nearly every class period included dozens of questions or comments, some of them considerably more than one sentence long, initiated by students (usually on general topics Sarah introduced, but not necessarily in reply to

a teacher's question). Because of this open classroom atmosphere, many different voices were included in the curricular discourse. People very often disagreed; students directed comments and challenges to each other as well as to the teacher in whole class discussions. For example, students were asked to pursue independent world studies projects. Sarah engaged students in brainstorming ideas for project topics by asking questions such as, "How many of you have been outside the country, or know somebody who has?" Then she called on students who had raised their hands to tell their stories. Because of the mixed income background of the class, these students were few in number, and most of these had relatives who had been overseas in the military. Being based on individual perceptions, students' stories sometimes conflicted: the opinions they offered stimulated disagreement. Sarah handled such conflict by giving the floor to each student who wanted to speak. She often addressed each student speaker by name and say, for example, "that was a very wise point, . . ." (paraphrasing the student's statement in clearer terms, e.g. 10/11 period 4). Sarah's role was that of facilitator, broadening access to the floor for less-aggressive students and clarifying social studies concepts.

Sometimes Sarah made use of her role as teacher to insist that students' prejudiced behavior, if not attitudes, be changed. Students were encouraged to, and did almost daily, ask questions about the news; sometimes this stimulated impromptu lessons on cultural or ideological differences. For example, one day during the 'political systems' unit, Sarah came in and told the class,

> I want to talk about something somebody brought up in third period. This is *extremely* important to anybody who will be living in this political system. Write this down [demonstrates on board]: NEO-NAZISM.
> [She defines "neo" as "new," and then:]
> Ms. Gilbert - What does the word "Nazism" mean to you?
> Chris - I forget.
> Karen - Racism
> Ms. Gilbert - Good; can you define that, in case anyone's not sure?
> Zach - They hate Jews.
> Sami - Like, hatred.
> Chris - Hating foreigners.
> Ms. Gilbert - [not noting this on board with others] I don't think...
> Jim - Hitler.
> Chris - Skinheads.
> Ms. Gilbert [writing each on the board] - That's *some* of it...
> Carlos - Germany.
> Lori - What about war? [Ms. Gilbert - Which war?]
> The one with Hitler. Two.
> Greg - Swastika. [Ms. Gilbert begins to draw one on the board,
> falters; Chris takes the chalk and draws it for her.]
> Sami - Concentration camps.
> Ms. Gilbert - Who can tell something they know about
> concentration camps? (-- 1/5 period 5)

The lesson went on, eventually drawing more than half of the class into the discussion, with the teacher clarifying the historical and ideological context of Nazism in 1930's Germany before returning to the current issue of neo-nazism in Germany and the U.S. It happened that this was the day a student had brought in to pass around a chunk his brother had chiseled off the newly-opened Berlin Wall. In response to Joel's question when the object was passed to him, Ms. Gilbert told the class when that Wall was erected and reviewed a few events in world history between World War Two and today. Sami wanted to know why the Wall was only spray painted on one side: the teacher took this opportunity to use the Berlin Wall (with its graffiti art on only the western side) as a graphic representation of the idea of freedom. Near the end of the period, Ms. Gilbert told the class,

> I want you to understand that this affected all of you. There were lots and lots of Jews killed, but there were many, many others, too. Anybody who wasn't so-called "Aryan," who didn't fit one particular ideal of the "good German."
> (-- 1/5 period 5)

This example seems to typify a particular approach to inclusion, applied across time (1930 to the present) and space (Germany and Europe, local U.S. events, and inside the classroom). In her pedagogical process, Sarah Gilbert used a strategy that included student voices in the production as well as the evaluation of knowledge. In her lesson's substantive content, she set a general agenda but followed students' interests, building bridges to access their range of prior knowledge. Sarah facilitated a discourse that appeared to broaden that knowledge, by highlighting the contrast among viewpoints and by reinforcing the idea (and names) of multiple actors on the historical stage. The explicit message of her lesson was that racism, hatred, and anti-Semitism are morally wrong and should be resisted: tolerance was taught, although not necessarily practiced.

Using Avery's 1992 definition, tolerance requires a direct encounter with something potentially intolerable, i.e. a problem involving a disliked person or group. An earlier lesson illustrates a closer encounter with the problem of tolerance. At times, several of Sarah's students openly resisted her viewpoint regarding cross-cultural issues, but it should be noted that in the process they practiced asserting their own rights in a conflictual context. As often happened, the teacher facilitated a discussion that began with a topic initiated by a student: what was unusual was the emotional tenor expressed on a social studies topic in the unplanned debate that followed.

> Brian gave an oral report that had been carried over from the earlier unit on U.S. geography. He told about Montgomery, Alabama, where he had lived for a year with his family. He told about how "the culture's really different." For example, "religion's really important there... There's no Mexican food at all there except

Taco Bell!" He described separate Black and white neighborhoods, racially-based fights, the ubiquitous Confederate flag, and an attitude of white supremacy. Sarah Gilbert picked up on the topic Brian had raised by telling her own story, telling the students that anti-racism involved making political choices about one's own behavior. She told the class that she had once accepted price bids for roofing work: she had chosen not to hire one of the lower-bidding contractors, partly on the basis of the Confederate flag he displayed on his belt buckle. To her, living in a northern context, the flag was a symbol of racism.

The teacher's story set off a loud and emotional discussion, beginning when Robert hotly asserted that the Confederate flag doesn't necessarily signify racism. Glen asked, "Isn't that discrimination, to not hire somebody just because of a flag?" *Every* student was on the edge of their seat, and most were talking, both to their neighbors and to the whole group. The loudest and most frequent voices were four white boys who were normally very reluctant participants in academic activity: these four were aggressively challenging the teacher's viewpoint. Once the discussion was going, Sarah concentrated on her facilitator role, calling on louder students to pause and give others a chance on the floor, asking questions, re-framing and clarifying issues that emerged. (--10/27 period 4)

After the bell rang, Sarah told me, "I like controversy, even when it makes them mad. It gets them thinking" (10/27 interview).

I saw two things in the foregoing episode. First, conflict in the curricular content definitely led to conflict in the pedagogical process (it was a necessary if not a sufficient condition). In a positive sense, this conflict generated high participation, including from generally timid, resistant, or uninterested students. In a more negative sense, openness to conflict made classroom control really difficult. Second, this conflictual discussion clearly stimulated thought and interest for some students. Even during the wildest part of the lesson, students were arguing and refuting, presenting and evaluating evidence, and responding to new information and unfamiliar perspectives with relevant ideas. Even better evidence, the students left the room still discussing the issue, so actively that the fifth period class (another group of students) came in after lunch already talking about it. Later, Sarah explained to her students the general strategy of which the above lesson is a reflection: "In this class, I try to give you more freedoms than you might get in some other classes, because I know that *this class is where you practice taking responsibility*" (2/8, *emphasis added*).

Ken: U.S. History as prominent (white) men's achievements

A. Learning inclusion

The only one of the four teachers who hardly mentioned either other parts of the world or non-Anglo groups in the U.S. was Ken Jacobs (eleventh grade U.S. history, North H.S.) Ken's American Revolution unit, for example, considered neither the British nor the Tory point of view in any depth: history was presented as if events had been inevitable, rather than forged

in fires of social conflict (10/9-10/26). Ken assigned "regular" textbook sections and tests from the teacher's guide, focusing on lower-order recording and interpretation of information. Typically, students' classroom tasks were to find words, names, and dates in textbook reading selections or in associated films, and to copy these short answers onto worksheet blanks. Ken rarely lectured and his students rarely discussed course material.

The unit on nineteenth century western migration (expansion) took the point of view of European-origin Americans (and not, for example, Native Americans or Mexicans), to the extent of using a Hollywood film on Davey Crockett and the Alamo (11/28-29). Even the textbook unit on "responsibilities of empire" didn't seem to reveal either opposing domestic opinions or the world views of people outside the United States (2/5-26). Ken taught about the United States as if the views of the winners were the only ones worth knowing. This representation of subject-matter provides a particular kind of background for viewing (or ignoring) the international pressures and relationships affecting the United States today.

Ken supplemented the textbook with a wide variety of guest speakers, who came every week and covered a wide range of views and topics. A few of these guest speakers were politically active and brought in controversial issues for class discussion. There was no obvious disincentive to students for asking critical questions of these speakers, since every student was rewarded with a standard number of points for asking any question of a guest, irrespective of the content of either the question or the response. In spite of this point incentive, I rarely saw more than five or ten out of either class (of thirty students) participate verbally on these occasions. One example will suffice:

> One of the more liberal speakers was from Citizens for a Better Environment. He gave a fifty minute presentation including a lecture and a twelve minute videotape, the substance of which was citizen action to monitor and prevent pollution. As the speaker summarized his intended message, laws alone without public pressure won't solve problems: "you can make a difference."
>
> Since the presentation took all period, students had to raise their hands while the speaker was still talking in order to ask any questions (four white male students and one Chicano male did so). Many students were obviously not paying attention; some did homework for other classes. The video presented images of citizen activism -- marches, rallies, chanting, picket signs, and so forth. Twice, the film included footage of people chanting in Spanish as well as English: both times, the head of a Mexican-American boy sitting near me snapped up as if on a spring. He watched the screen for under a minute each time, and then went back to gazing at his desk-top. (--5/21 period 2)

In theory, this session on citizen activism could have included voices and perspectives that were usually silent in Ken's social studies curriculum. Because of the speaker's style, however, and because there was no articulated or evident connection between these incidental lessons and

the planned curriculum (guest presentations were never reflected on tests, for example), it seems highly unlikely that any message of inclusion was communicated to most of the students.

B. Inclusion in learning

The sheer quantity and range of guest speakers in Ken Jacobs' class did present students with a model of multiple and multiethnic citizens and leaders from their area. Yet the many military recruiters (one every two or three weeks) and some of the other speakers seemed to present a hidden curriculum that silenced many students by denying consciousness of social conflict, contradictions, or diversity. Here is one example:

> A speaker from the local office of the National Archives gave a slide show and lecture presentation. She gave a confusing demonstration of "soundexing" names in order to trace ancestors who might have spelled their names differently, and invited students to visit her office to study their family histories. She mentioned in passing that privacy laws prevented the Archives from having any documents more recent than 72 years ago – *long* before nearly all of these students' families would have arrived in the area (thus her invitation was operative for perhaps five students). She gave a thick resource packet to each student, including a "Pedigree Chart" that students were supposed to fill in. The chart asked for names and places of birth and death for full sets of parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents. As she moved ahead and some students faltered, Ken Jacobs injected one comment to the class: "Some people know this information and some don't, so don't worry about it." (--2/1 period 2)

The idea of tracing one's ancestry and immigrant origins is not inherently exclusive. However, there is more to this story than the content or intent itself. With material presented in this way, with this set of tasks and resources (for example, the speaker's examples of European family names or the mimeographed "pedigree" form with blanks for two parents, four grandparents and so forth), the students who were children of recent immigrants and/or of disrupted or non-traditional families were likely to get a message of exclusion, if they got a message at all.

Ken practiced inclusion in the sense that every student did the same thing, nobody was embarrassed or asked to take risks in public, guest speakers brought in a variety of interests and persuasions, and the coursework was non-ambiguous and easy. He made a point of telling me that it was important to him that nobody be anxious and *nobody be left behind.* Ken assigned students to write short family autobiographies (a considerably more open-ended task than either the guest presentation just described or Ken's usual lessons, confidentially shared with the teacher alone and never discussed in class). He explained to me the purpose of the autobiography exercise: "I like to know about their lives, so I can understand them and help them when they need it. I would never get to know the [170 daily] students without an assignment like this" (11/20 interview). Ken showed considerable interest and compassion for the whole range of his students: "some of these stories will wring your heart," he told me,

relating from memory many details from at least five or six of this class's papers (11/27 interview).

Tom: U.S. History as problem-solving by actors with different viewpoints

A. Learning inclusion

What made Ken's curriculum so consensus-oriented was not simply the textbook he used: Tom Clark used the same book in his eleventh grade U.S. history class at the same school, North H.S.). In spite of its bland text sections, this book did contain inserts and side-bars that included identifiable voices and opposing perspectives. Tom led a lesson based on a textbook insert on bias and primary sources, called "two views of slavery" (12/1). The following week, Tom pursued the question of conflicts between the North and South before the Civil War. He often used analogies to recent events to explain and to elicit student reactions, for example regarding the "Know Nothing" opposition party of the period:

> Mr. Clark - The idea here is, I want you to understand *why* did we have a Civil War in the United States... What does the word *compromise* mean?... Who would be *against* extending slavery into the North? Why?... How can government have secret organizations like that? What do you think of Ollie North?
> (-- 12/6 period 3).

Added-on content in textbooks or curriculum guides does not by itself challenge a standard chronologically-arranged curricular framework (McKee 1988, Plank 1987). When even a textbook insert was not available in the the textbook's mainstream view of the "westward migration" unit mentioned above, for example, Tom reviewed the contrast between the colonial policies of the British (extermination and confinement to reservations) and the Spanish (conversion to Christianity and assimilation) toward Native Americans during the 19th century (2/5 period 3). The contrast was explicitly framed as a conflict, and students (as a large group, in which anyone could volunteer and a small number usually spoke) were asked to evaluate the justice or injustice of each policy. Further, the teacher linked this topic to the larger themes of Manifest Destiny and colonialism as expressed in current events (social problems on Indian reservations today and recent U.S. military action in Panama). The tacit ground rules focused on reasoning, contrasting, and defending or criticizing the bases for different opinions.

When Tom taught about the American Revolution, he stressed the *concept* of revolution and the idea that the war could have come out another way, by reference to other revolutions and attempted revolutions across time and space. He taught history in terms of concepts and problems that transcend social groups and national borders. "Can people succeed today in changing their governments?" he asked the class. By half-way through that class period, I heard several student voices at once, and *nearly every* student had something to say (10/12 period 5).

In what looked at first like an instance comparable to his other uses of international analogies described above, Tom Clark used what he thought was common experience -- the media coverage of the Tianenman Square resistance and suppression in China six months earlier -- as an analogy to expand students' understanding of U.S. history. The topic was the origins of the Civil War, and Tom was trying to get across the idea that the events of the time, viewed in context, were not inevitable or the only possible outcome of the era's conflicts. He asked, "Couldn't slavery have gone on?" *Nobody* responded. He re-phrased several times, still getting more confused or bored looks than discussion. He tried the analogy:

> Mr. Clark - What correlation might there be between this slavery conflict and what happened in China, at Tianenman Square?
> various students - None!
> Chris - Why are we talking about China? I thought this was *American* history.
> Mr. Clark - You don't think we should talk about foreign policy?
> Chris - We should concentrate on *American* things.
> Mr. Clark - You don't see the connections?
> Chris - No.
> Mr. Clark - Chris, there's a wider world out there! (-- 12/13 period 5)

Tom briefly explained that the movement for freedom at Tianenman Square had not succeeded in changing the course of Chinese government, while we look back at the Civil War almost as if war and freeing the slaves had been the only way out of that conflict. Receiving no response, he passed out the first section of the chapter test, and students began working silently. Apparently the idea, that what happens in the world informs U.S. events and that the outcomes affect the selective way events are remembered, did not get across to most students this time. A partial explanation of this misunderstanding could be prior social studies education: if most subject-matter has minimized the conflicts inherent in international and multicultural interaction by expressing a single mainstream U.S. view of human events, then students are not given a schema or conceptual basis for seeing such connections when they occur.

B. Inclusion in learning

Sometimes, Tom Clark explicitly linked people or groups with ways of believing, by reference to their opposing viewpoints. For example, in a lesson using a political cartoon in the textbook to lead a discussion about the Monroe Doctrine and Teddy Roosevelt's "Big Stick" policy:

> Now, I'm not telling you what to believe about this: your opinion is as good as anyone else's. Some people think the U.S. was helping to resolve disputes between the Old World (that's the European colonial powers) and the New World, especially Latin America. Other people think the U.S. was just preserving its own sphere of influence, controlling the Americas for itself. (-- 3/12 period 3)

This example shows the relationship between the inclusion of diverse voices (views) in the curricular content and the inclusion of diverse voices in the pedagogical process. Tom represented disagreement among the actors of the historical period in order to facilitate expression of disagreement in the classroom. Even though the material was new and complicated, about half the class participated in this fifteen-minute discussion. On other days, Tom accomplished a similar goal by calling on a particular student to represent the viewpoint opposite the one expressed by her classmate (e.g. 2/9 period 3).

Tom's curriculum confronted in some depth the relationship between the rest of the world and American history, as well as between the material and the minds and hearts of his students. For example, a human rights unit placed the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights in comparative international context. On a day mid-way through this unit, Tom's class was arranged in a large circle, for discussion of group work done the day before. The student groups had read two case studies -- one about a child living on the streets in Ecuador, the other about feeding homeless people in a town in California.

> Linda - Why should we help people, like in Ethiopia and stuff? I don't see why -- I mean, there are plenty of people here that need help, too.
> [Mr. Clark begins to reply, then sits back as other students take up the topic]
> Yesenia - They need it more than we do, though!
> Adeline - Yeah, it's lots easier to get help here.
> Linda - But we should start with our own people...
> Yesenia - Out there, they don't have the local Salvation Army and stuff there.
> Adeline - You don't see those kind of little stick legs here [shows with her hand a small circle like a starving child's limb], like you see in the pictures. They've got it so much worse over there, it's pitiful! (-- 11/21 period 3)

The reading had been about a street child in Ecuador; the first student brought up a situation in eastern Africa. The variety of students in the class used their different as well as their common experiences (class work and the television coverage of the Ethiopian famine) to inform their discussion of a political concept, basic human rights. It is interesting, in relation to Anzaldúa's reflection quoted above, that the students who were able and willing to take the viewpoint that starving people should be helped were both recent immigrants (from Mexico). Tom made consistent choices to integrate conflictual material into his lessons: like Ruth, Tom spent considerable time creating his own materials, activities, and tests for the purpose of teaching critical thinking but also to motivate and engage a variety of students.

Discussion: citizenship education in a plural society

The inclusion of multicultural and multi-status students in the process of becoming democratic citizens is an essential goal of social studies education, but educators have very different ways of trying to reach that goal. Each teacher's classroom is a laboratory for modelling

and practicing behaviors relevant to citizenship: like any laboratory, the classroom is not the same as the "outside world," but it both reflects the questions that are (and aren't) asked there and reflects an attempt to explain and to shape that world.

Contrasting lessons regarding social conflict and citizenship expectations

In part as a result of the ways they handled and avoided conflict in their curricula, the four teachers in these case studies presented different images of the active citizens who share the power to govern in this society. By extension, they presented different views of their students' various roles as citizens. Teachers like Tom and Ruth presented a relatively broad range of people as "knowers" and "doers" in society, and asked their students to understand information about those citizens' beliefs and origins. These teachers reflected the idea that students would "learn inclusion" by learning how an inclusive set of people were important and how their conflicting viewpoints had shaped and strengthened the society. Ruth, in particular, felt that students should achieve this content background *prior* to active (informed) participation in society, and that school classrooms were uniquely suited to provide this information-centered education.

> I think I run a very tight class, in control, so they don't have much opportunity to disagree with each other. Maybe that's too bad... In the total picture of what's important for humanity, I think it's more important to have people respect each other's opinions, [but] In our culture, people are expected to have a certain core of knowledge. Maybe the purpose of education is to transmit the background, so that the questions can be asked [at a later time]. (Ruth, 1/5 interview)

Teachers like Tom and Sarah required their students to *practice being* "knowers" and "doers" by taking and defending diverse viewpoints in the classroom, whether or not they first had acquired a broad informational background. These teachers reflected the idea that only students who were "included in learning" would develop the skills, confidence, and inclination to continue learning and participating in the (conflictual) wider political society. Sarah, in particular, felt that this affective engagement and guided practice with nonviolent conflict management would provide a framework for students' *later* acquisition of information in specific contexts, and that school classrooms were the only place where many students would be able to get this practice-centered education.

> If you teach them to think, then they can use those skills to solve conflicts in the future. Whereas if they just get that rote stuff... (Tom, 10/12 interview).

When I asked Tom about the way he saw his work in relation to citizenship education, he was at first quite taken aback. "Citizenship, to me, is conformity," he told me. "*This* isn't

citizenship, it's *life!"* (5/21 interview). Tom had come to understand citizenship education as a particular approach to teaching that stressed uncritical respect for traditions and the historical past. His is not an uncommon view, particularly among those educated in the 1950's and early 1960's. Ken apparently agreed with this view of citizenship education, but without objecting to it so strongly. In fact, he used some of his presidential biographies and patriotic movies for this purpose:

> The only thing that teaches citizenship is the films, the speakers, and my worksheets. It *may* be in the book, but it's too subtle; the kids don't get it. (Ken, 5/21 interview)

Instead of adopting un-criticized national values, Tom wanted his students to "understand the present in the context of the past," to propose alternate viewpoints or explanations regarding past and future events. He designed his history lessons to show students, "Hey, here's another view. There's not a right way or a wrong way to believe" (5/21 interview). This approach to social studies opens the floor to multiple voices and opposing opinions:

> I love it when a kid challenges me. Isn't that great? Like when A___ said she disagreed the other day... That's wonderful, shows they're thinking, gives the other students another viewpoint to consider. (Tom, 5/21 interview)

Although Tom did not label it as such, he presents here an alternate image of citizenship education. In his view, social studies is self-conscious preparation for future participation in a complex pluralist society. Here, students practice behaviors associated with the constructive employment of conflict for change.

The four teachers each asked their students to do somewhat different kinds of thinking and interacting. Tom Clark, Sarah Gilbert, and Ruth Murray consistently asked their students to practice more difficult thinking and participatory tasks than Ken Jacobs did. Like Ruth, Tom brought up complicated conflicts and went beyond the minimum information presented in the textbook. Like Sarah, Tom required students to take and defend stands on issues, rather than merely remembering the viewpoints of others. It is not clear that more students were left behind in these classes, despite his high expectations and riskier pedagogy, but it is not clear that the converse is necessarily true either. (Tom and Ken gave remarkably similar "normal" distributions of grades from A to F; I did not regularly see Ruth's or Sarah's grades). Sometimes, many of the students took up with enthusiasm the challenges they were given; other times, many of them resisted. Future research is needed to explore this intersection between the curriculum and particular sub-groups of students.

Some students, at times, resisted the kinds of inclusive participatory demands made by Sarah and Tom. For example, only small numbers participated actively in some class discussions (this was true in Ken's and Ruth's classes, as well, but this is less relevant in those cases because their curricula were intended to emphasize content over process). Both teachers reflected in interviews on the days when they had difficulty engaging students in concentrated open-minded thinking and dialogue.

> Ms. Gilbert [After a slow discussion of global environmental destruction] I've been thinking a lot about it, and I finally decided that the reason the students are bored and not doing so well is that what we've been covering is too diffuse. You know, the global village and all that. I think they'll do better if [the subjects covered are] more specific. So, tomorrow we'll begin a unit on Japan; then we'll do China, then India, and then we'll see... (Sarah, 2/20 interview)

> Mr. Clark It's one of those tensions, you know? You try to get discussions onto a higher and higher level. The price you pay for getting [less confident] students involved is lowering the level of the discussion. They don't *want* to be called on. I ask G___ a question, and he doesn't get it. I keep trying to give him a successful experience answering a question, asking simple questions again and again. The trouble is, it slows down the whole process. The discussion can't go as far, or make the rest of the kids think as much. (Tom, 2/5 interview)

> If I'm feeling inadequate, I'll tend to rely on students ... who already know a lot. But that's unfortunate, and I try not to do that. Because the other kids will rely on them, think *they're* the ones with the right answers. (Tom, 5/21 interview)

Tom's and Sarah's reflections on the subject bring up some important issues regarding inclusive educational practice. Conflictual discussion methods, especially those that try to involve a wide spectrum of students, each of whom understands the subject differently, can easily be, as Sarah puts it, "diffuse." A teacher needs a particular knowledge of both pedagogy and subject-matter to know how to represent which issues with a few guiding words, how to manage a participatory discussion that can inform and illustrate key ideas. How much easier, in terms of planning and predictability, to lecture or rely on the "top" students' contributions! If these pedagogical difficulties are evident when curricular content is monocultural and consensual, then they are even more evident when the content is also conflictual, hence conceptually difficult and personally or politically risky.

Students in the same classroom may experience and practice different lessons

In every classroom I observed, some students were practicing the knowledge and skills for active citizenship far more than others. The most striking similarity among these four teachers' classrooms that was the persistent *silence* among large numbers of students in *every* teacher's classroom. I carefully documented both numbers and names of student participants, or I might

never have noticed the pervasiveness of this phenomenon. By high school, students who feel alienated or timid or unable to take risks have learned to melt into corners, to fit in, and to not be noticed. Even in rousing discussions where it *felt* to the teacher and to the observer as if virtually everyone was involved, when I would check my notes afterwards there would be maybe fifteen names out of thirty recorded as speakers. I don't suggest that verbal participation is everything -- students learn from models as well as by practicing. But if it is somehow true that a vast underclass of students *can't* speak up to assert their opinions or needs in the protected "laboratory" context of their social studies classrooms, then surely this is "teaching" them something about their eventual roles as citizens in society.

Multicultural and multi-status interaction in the classroom is obviously possible, but its effects are complicated. The opportunity to interact with peers in a competitive school environment can serve to confirm and rigidify, rather than to challenge, students' mutual expectations regarding their peers' superiority and inferiority (Cohen 1986). Understanding and treating status inequalities in participatory classrooms is a pedagogical skill that is not widely known (or taught, for example in pre-service education programs). Thus the hidden curriculum in even a well-intending teacher's classroom may favor exclusion.

Part of the problem for silent students involves the mis-match between the "codes" used by the dominant culture (represented by the teacher, the textbook, and the implemented curriculum) and the comfortable (indigenous) discourse patterns of many of today's students. This difference in communication patterns causes both cross-cultural misunderstanding and at times a divergence of educational goals.

> Many liberal educators hold that the primary goal for education is for children to become autonomous, to develop fully who they are in the classroom setting without having arbitrary, outside standards forced upon them. This is a very reasonable goal for people whose children are already participants in the culture of power and who have already internalized its codes. But parents who don't function within that culture often want something else... They want to ensure that the school provides their children with discourse patterns, interactional styles, and spoken and written language codes that will allow them success in the larger society. - Delpit (1988), p.285

Ruth Murray's curriculum seems in many ways to be in response to a theory like Delpit's. She seemed to ask her students to practice more difficult, or at least different, skills than Sarah's students did: she asked them to extend their ideas further beyond themselves, by requiring a substantial and tightly-structured body of prior knowledge and analytical work rather than letting students talk off the top of their heads. On the other hand, she was consistently explicit and unambiguous in the "codes" she used, both in describing subject-matter content and in guiding students' behavior in pedagogical activities. Lower-status student don't necessarily get

incorporated as active citizens by extra-curricular means: where will they learn these codes for participation, if not in school? Further research is required, to explore the possibility that a more demanding (and more substantively-conflictual) social studies curricula may, if material is clearly presented and explained, give lower-status students a more thorough background, and thus better opportunity, for future participation as citizens.

Metz showed, in the context of a newly-desegregated school, that conflictual, less-predictable, and public pedagogy (as opposed to lecture or individual seatwork, in which students are more isolated from one another) was particularly difficult for low-status or culturally-different students (1978). This is in keeping with Delpit's theory, and with Ruth's way of handling that dilemma. It is difficult to gauge such an impact reliably from my case studies, because Ken and Ruth did not facilitate discussions comparable to those of Sarah or Tom. Sometimes I picked up students' exasperated looks, confusion, unusual participation, or obvious interest, but without further research involving student interviews and performance evaluation data it is impossible to draw systematic conclusions about what goes on in lower-status students' minds when they are asked to confront conflict in their social studies courses. It is reasonable to assume, however, that most adolescent students, especially those of lower social status, are reluctant to risk exposing themselves to embarrassment in front of peers and a teacher, and many are reluctant even to take a point of view that might differ from influential peers.

In the open participatory environments of Sarah's class, and to a lesser extent in Tom's, many students did feel free to express nearly anything, including at times rude or ethnocentric remarks. Sarah handled most of this with brief and gentle reminders regarding ground rules for respectful behavior. This generally succeeded in maintaining a hum of academically-related activity in the class. One Monday, however, Sarah approached me with the following story:

> I wanted to tell you that I read them the riot act, after things just got totally out of hand on Wednesday. They were unable to settle down at all for the [European geography] quiz... [After the quiz] they were watching a video about what's going on in Czechoslovakia and they were laughing, just because the people were speaking Czech. Finally, I'd just had it... [On Thursday, she came in mad and made a speech about] limits on behavior, respect for differences, the whole global village thing... I feel that it worked. Things are better. (Sarah, 12/4 interview)

Delpit would point out that, in the above instance, Sarah resorted to a less-ambiguous style of authoritative interaction, in order to make the boundaries of classroom interaction clear to more of her students (1988).

While practice with conflict in school may be important preparation for citizenship in the real political world, classrooms often remain segregated from that world. McNeil found that

high school social studies "teachers deliberately chose not to communicate content which might show students the injustices and inadequacies of their social and political systems" (1986, p.157). Tom, Ruth, and Sarah, each in different ways, are to some degree exceptions to this tendency. The main reason McNeil's teachers gave for their reluctance to confront conflictual content was that they felt it would jeopardize their control of classroom behavior: this fear was at times, but by no means always, supported by my observations. Teachers are expected to keep order, no matter what: it takes particular understanding of both pedagogy and subject-matter to risk instigating debate in a diverse (pluralist) classroom.

Democratic participation, inside the classroom laboratory as well as out in the "real world," requires skills that can only be developed with practice. Some students learn to participate from models and practice outside of school; other students do not have this "cultural capital," and therefore school provides their only opportunity to learn these skills. McNeil's finding that that students, as well as teachers, were not used to divergent questioning is well-supported by my case studies (1986 p.144-145). When given the opportunity to discuss an issue critically, some students (in both McNeil's cases and mine) were troubled and resisted, while others, presumably more confident, jumped into the opportunity with enthusiasm (and very occasionally with the reckless abandon that their teachers apparently feared).

A generation ago, Weiler pointed out that "the individual's ability to cope with dissent and conflict [is important to] the system's ability to manage such conflict," and concluded that political socialization research should pay attention to the positive value of conflict (and tolerance for conflict) as an educational outcome (1972, p.62). Presenting and practicing the management of ideological alternatives in social studies education presents the holders of those viewpoints as (additional) knowers; thus it presents criticism and invention of alternatives as legitimate endeavors. Instead of being excluded for believing differently, dissenters are portrayed as valued citizens. People with high social status generally feel (and act) entitled to dissent; however, dissent from below is more difficult (yet more essential to the democratic ideal), because of discourse mis-matches that may cause misunderstanding and because of the suspicion with which challenges are often greeted. Public school, in the mixed-income and multiethnic neighborhoods of high schools such as North, West, and East, is an arena in which a wider range of citizens *could* learn both the skills and the knowledge for constructive democratic participation, including dissent. The diverse wisdom of practice demonstrated by these four teachers gives us a better understanding both of what kinds of citizenship education are *possible* in urban classrooms, and of what skills and strategies it would take to truly teach inclusion.

APPENDIX: research methodology

I chose two districts (North[1] and East-West) serving heterogeneous student populations. Care was exercised to avoid major variations among the population settings. The chart that follows gives ethnicity information for each school as a whole. All schools are in economically mixed areas, neither the wealthiest nor the poorest in the region.

Ethnic Composition of Student Populations[2]

	PERCENTAGE	OF	STUDENTS
Ethnic Group	North H.S.	West H.S.	East H.S.
Amer. Indian	0.1	0.2	0.3
Asian (other)	8.7	5.1	4.2
Filipino	10.2	0.9	1.6
Pacific Islander	5.5	1.7	3.0
Black	5.2	10.0	3.3
White (other)	37.3	54.2	49.4
Hispanic	33.0	27.8	38.5
TOTAL No. of Students	1286	1404	1606

I looked for teachers who were comparable in terms of teaching experience, because (1) they would be most likely to have developed consistent personal teaching strategies, and (2) the research literature has associated the practice of classroom conflict with authority risks for teachers. Inexperienced teachers tend to have more difficulty establishing clear authority relations with students than seasoned teachers, thus variation on this dimension could confuse results in a study such as this one.

These basic commonalities of school population and teaching experience thus established, I looked to maximize contrast among a small number of teacher subjects along the two intersecting dimensions that have generally been treated separately in earlier research literature – (1) amount of conflict presented in curricular content, and (2) amount of conflict allowed or encouraged in pedagogical processes. Initial observations and interviews were conducted with a range of potential teachers to identify teacher subjects who contrasted sufficiently on these dimensions. I was fortunate to find four friendly and committed individuals, each of whom "fit" fairly well into one of the above general approaches to teaching social studies.

Ken and Tom teach eleventh grade U.S. History. I identified Tom during a pilot study, in which I had observed his extraordinary ability to use conflict as a learning opportunity in his classes. Since he already knew me, he agreed readily to participate in this study. Through brief observations and discussions with five social studies teachers and two administrators at North H.S. in the fall of 1989, I chose a second teacher at the same school. This teacher, Ken, was matched with Tom in terms of approximate age, gender, and teaching experience because these characteristics might logically have considerable bearing on the teacher's management of conflict. I chose Ken because he teaches the same course as Tom, to a similar population of students, while at the same time there is tremendous contrast in the ways the two teachers handle conflict in their pedagogy. After a preliminary observation and brief discussion, Ken agreed to participate in the study.

I followed a similar process in identifying the other two teachers in the study. Sarah and Ruth teach ninth grade World Studies. Ruth was recommended to me by staff members of an international education agency, on the basis of her enthusiasm and experience in handling international curriculum. Preliminary observations at her East H.S. classroom quickly convinced me of her enthusiasm and ability to use substantive conflict (generally in the form of international or cross-cultural material). Ruth agreed to participate in the study, with the *caveat* that she would only be available during the first semester, and both of her classes were labeled the "advanced standing" track. She had two such classes, both ethnically diverse.

---

[1]All proper names in the case studies are pseudonyms.

[2] Statistics are from 1989 school documents, with categories determined by school officials. "White" and "Black" do not include those of Hispanic ancestry; "Asian" and "Hispanic" include both established citizens and a variety of recent immigrants.

Ruth believed that these classes were not particularly different -- and not taught in a different manner -- from her standard-track classes (interview 1/3). In a controlled comparison using standard outcome measures, an advanced track class would have thrown off research results. In this case study method, however, the potential difference provided an opportunity to inquire into a particularly "pronounced" setting. For example, the teacher's confidence in her students' ability could encourage her to demonstrate her widest possible repertoire of strategies for using conflict in her teaching.

After observing and talking with four other teachers and an administrator in Ruth's district, I found a teacher teaching the same course at West H.S. Sarah was matched with Ruth in approximate age, gender, and teaching experience, yet she handles conflict in her classroom in a different manner. West H.S. is at the wealthier end of the same "union" district: a student may theoretically choose either high school, but many students apparently go to the school closer to their home. Some economic difference in the classroom populations might be expected from the difference between East H.S. and West H.S. However, the opposite tendency is presented by the contrast between the average populations of "advanced" (at East H.S.) versus "regular" classes (at West H.S.). Sarah agreed to participate in the study after a brief interview.

In summary, the rough dimensions of contrast between the teacher subjects chosen for these case studies are as follows:

		CURRIC. (less conflict)	CONTENT (more conflict)
PEDAG. PROCESS	(less conflict)	KEN	RUTH
	(more conflict)	SARAH	TOM

Ken's teaching generally avoids conflict in either curricular substance or pedagogical process, by focusing on independent seatwork involving simple manipulation and reporting of information from text pages and films. Tom, in the same school, uses both pedagogical conflict (for example, bringing in conflictual issues for open discussion) and curricular conflict (for example, requiring analysis of opposing points of view on particular curricular subjects). Sarah's pedagogy is built around simple curricular content coupled with a very open climate of conflictual discussion. Ruth (in the same district) builds her curriculum around the presentation of conflictual information (especially multicultural and international perspectives) by means of tightly teacher-controlled pedagogical strategies. In every case, teachers were presenting standard courses that are required for high school graduation. Both U.S. History teachers used the same textbook; neither World Studies teacher relied generally on a textbook.

My research question called for observing teachers over an extended time, handling many different activities and topics with their students. During the first semester beginning in mid-September, I watched each teacher during two regular class periods, twice every week. I observed Tom and Ken until late May, 1990. Ruth left the last week in January and Sarah took an unplanned leave the last week in March. My observations included viewing and reading all material assigned to the students, as well as watching how that material was handled in practice by teachers and students.

I observed the same two class periods for each teacher, an average of twice per week per class over several months, in order to get familiar with the names and behaviors of specific students. I had access to seating charts in every class, in order to learn the names of even the quieter students. My intention was to get a detailed picture of the implemented curriculum, including who participated in the educational processes the teachers constructed. I wanted to study the *interface* between the teachers' curricula and the various individuals in their classrooms, rather than assuming the curriculum was a uni-directional input to any "average" student or the class as a whole.

I had predicted that some kinds of pedagogy would create more operational differences between classes than others (by giving students different opportunities to affect classroom events). It turned out that differences between any teacher's two classes were quite small. By chance, administrative changes in Sarah's and Tom's schools removed one of the classes I was observing from each of their classrooms after the first semester, when Ruth also left. Thus my observations were reduced to one class per teacher during the second semester. My total hours of classroom observation (not including interviews) were about 52 for Ruth, 68 for Sarah, and 76 for both Tom and Ken.

I gathered three kinds of data. First, a limited-inference protocol, used daily, recorded topics covered, task structures (organization of classroom work roles), and numbers of verbal actions by teacher and students *(see appendix)*. Second, daily long-hand notes recorded who participated, how they

participated, and the subjects of verbal interactions. I also kept copies of all printed material (including worksheets) handed out to students. Third, every two or three weeks (on average), my informal interviews with each teacher probed for perceptions, intentions, and explanations of classroom events. Teachers were always welcome to see and criticize my observation and interview notes, although in practice they rarely paid much attention to them.

In the classroom, I was an unobtrusive participant observer. I sat at a table by the side of the room or in a pupil's desk, watching and taking notes much the way any quiet student would act in class. In the more interactive classrooms (compared to the most teacher-centered classes, where students were not intended to talk to one another), I interacted a little more. While I did not participate directly in students' small-group or individual tasks, interactive structures allowed me to move around the classroom, listening to students work as well as watching the teacher. After the first month I learned to also record how many students spoke publicly during lessons, including their names to help me notice unusual participation and unusual silences. In the more interactive classrooms it was fairly common for a student to ask me a question, much as they would ask their peers (for example, "what page are we on?" or "how do you fill in this map?"). If I knew the answer based on what I heard in class, I gave brief responses to such questions. Most of the time, however, I was ignored. My role in the structure and activity of any classroom was so unimportant to the participants that I quickly began to feel invisible. After the first week or so, nobody paid me much attention.

Every class had a large number of students -- sometimes as many as half the class -- who had learned a trick of invisibility, rather similar to the invisibility I developed as observer. Classroom activities didn't revolve around these students any more than they revolved around me, a stranger with no standard role in their educational process. These kids did their work to one extent or another, kept to themselves, and didn't make waves. After the first couple of months of observation, I learned to keep lists of students who participated (operationally this usually meant speaking in class, although there were occasional non-verbal tasks such as putting something on the chalkboard). I felt that the involvement of the otherwise-uninvolved might be a clue to the salience of certain pedagogical events.

In December, I gave each teacher a copy of my first tentative analysis of conflict's role in her/his own teaching. I asked for criticism, reminding them that I was a beginner at this sort of research and therefore bound to be inaccurate at first. The reflective discussions that resulted from this interaction initiated a generally deeper level of communication, and this mutual understanding lasted through subsequent interviews. Because Ruth's one semester of teaching ended soon thereafter, my interviews with her missed some of this opportunity for enhanced discussion in comparison with the other teachers. This open type of discussion with the teachers carries a risk of increasing the impact of the researcher's presence on the teachers' behavior, but holds the advantage of enhancing respectful dialogue between teacher and researcher. The few situations in which I sensed a possible change in a teacher's work as a result of our discussions are pointed out as they arise in the case studies.

I kept long-hand notes about what conflicts (if any) came up during each observation, what attitudes were expressed by whom, and how class members seemed to engage in the material set before them. In order not to pre-judge the educational relevance of particular conflicts, I tried to record everything from mild procedural disagreements to substantive criticism to analysis of opposing perspectives. As a way to tie the educational use of conflict to specific evidence and implications, I noted the various ways each teacher represented key social studies concepts to their students, even when I was not certain at the time whether or not any given representation was conflictual. Because my general expectation proved correct -- classroom conflict is very often avoided -- it was not as overwhelming a recording task as might be imagined.

My criteria for conflicts to record in field notes were as broad as I could make them. The only limit was that conflicts must be expressed, in such a way that a participant in the class had a chance of noticing the event: I did not attempt to read minds. Facial or body language was only recorded if it was obvious enough that others in the classroom seemed to be "reading" its messages. The basic subject matter of a class was always recorded, including whether and how multiple points of view might be mentioned. Any time the ghost of a disagreement showed up -- either in the text (input in the form of reading or lecture or film), in a teacher's explanation, or in a student response -- I wrote down the voices that I (and any attentive student) could hear or see. Even with this open scope, there were many days when I had no conflict of any kind to record. The relative intensity of the various conflicts I did observe is communicated through situated narratives regarding the substance and behavior of particular interactions.

Erickson writes that "American classrooms are odd not only in terms of what happens there, but in terms of what *does not happen*" (1972). Certainly this axiom applies to the study of conflict. He advocates using methods derived from ethnography for studying the "obvious" and the taken-for-granted, examining

their meanings to classroom participants. Classroom conflict carries a dazzling array of unwritten rules, understandings, and attitudes. The processes by which conflict is *identified* as conflict, is or is not *allowed* to occur, and *affects* participants are filtered and constrained by countless cultural and individual factors.

I wanted to understand the overall messages and impressions left by a year in these teachers' classrooms. To emphasize the pupil's-eye-view, I used no electronic aids, only paper and pen. Even without a tape recorder, my impressions are considerably more detailed than those of most pupils for two reasons. One, I have been in lots more social studies classes, and classes about social studies classes. Therefore, I had mental categories (ways to understand and remember) that helped me construct meaning from what I experienced. Two, I paid attention, even when the class was deadly boring! Thus I saw much of what I imagine many students saw, plus some things they missed. On the other hand, I experienced the curriculum through frame of reference that I brought in with me.

Interviews with teachers were free-flowing, often spontaneous, and not structured in advance. I wanted to know what the teachers considered important or troubling about their teaching, rather than how they would respond to what was on my mind. Without exception, the four teachers seemed willing and eager to talk to me after the first few weeks. School structures tend to isolate teachers, which stymies their opportunities to reflect constructively on their teaching with peers (see Cochran-Smith & Lytle 1991, Lortie 1975, Shulman 1986). Admittedly their willingness to talk with me was one criterion for their selection, but I feel these teachers went beyond that obligation. Often in a spare moment before or after class, the teacher would begin talking to me about their teaching. I might remind them they were in a research interview by saying "Wait! That's interesting. Let me write that down." When I did use prompts or probes, they were general, such as "How do you think that went today?" or "Will you tell me why you chose that activity?" Thus conflicts were brought up by the teacher, if at all, rather than put on the agenda by the researcher.

In summary, I immersed myself in selected classroom environments for several months. Everybody had plenty of opportunity to get used to me. On the one hand, I informed both students and teachers in advance of my interest in conflict in their classroom learning situations. On the other hand, I was there for so long and so often that putting on any show for me would have been difficult and unlikely. Students mostly ignored me, since I had no role in the system that regulated their behavior. Teachers seemed to tell me what was uppermost in their minds about their curriculum and teaching, because I was a sympathetic adult present in their work environment. The combined result of these data collection strategies is a detailed picture of four implemented social studies curricula in specific multiethnic contexts, and a flavor of each teacher's reflections about their own work.

REFERENCES

Acker, Sandra (1987), "Feminist theory and the study of gender and education," *International Review of Education*, 23.

AEGIS, Global Educators, Las Palomas de Taos, and The Stanley Foundation (1989), "Quality global/international education: what political stance?" conference report (April).

Anderson, Lee (1979), *Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Anzaldúa, Gloria (1987), *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*, San Francisco, Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Anyon, Jean (1979), "Ideology and U.S. history textbooks," *Harvard Educational Review*, vol.49, no.3, pp.361-386.

Anyon, Jean (1981), "Social Class and School Knowledge," *Curriculum Inquiry*, vol.11, no.1, pp.3-42.

Apple, Michael (1979), *Ideology and Curriculum*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Avery, Patricia G (1988), "Political tolerance among adolescents," *Theory and Practice in Social Education*, vol.16, no.2, pp.183-201.

Avery, Patricia G (1992), "Do All of the people have all of the rights all of the time?" paper for American Educational Research Assn.

Bandura, Robert (1986), *Social Foundations of Thought and Action*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Banks, James (1990), "Citizenship education for a pluralistic democratic society," *The Social Studies* (September/October), pp.210-214.

Barbagli, Marzio and M. Dei (1977), "Socialization into political apathy and subordination," in J. Karabel and A. Halsey (eds), *Power and Ideology in Education*, London, Oxford Press.

Becker, James (1990), "Curriculum considerations in global studies," in K. Tye (ed), *Global Education: from Thought to Action*, Alexandria, VA, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, pp.67-85.

Belenky, Mary F., Blythe M. Clinchy, Nancy R. Goldberger, and Jill M. Tarule (1986), *Women's Ways of Knowing*, New York, Basic Books.

Berlak, Ann and Harold Berlak (1981), *Dilemmas of Schooling: Teaching and Social Change*, London, Methuen.

Berlynne, D. E. (1969), "Recent developments in Piaget's work," in W. Herman (ed), *Current Research in Elementary School Social Studies*, New York, Macmillan, pp.103-117.

Boulding, Elise (1988), *Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World*, New York, Teachers College Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre and J.C. Passeron (1977), *Reproduction: in Education, Society and Culture*, London, Sage Publications.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis (1986), *Democracy and Capitalism*, New York, Basic Books.

Brock-Utne (1989), *Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education*, New York, Pergamon.

California State Department of Education (1987), *History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools* , Sacramento.

Carnoy, Martin and Henry Levin (1985), *Schooling and Work in the Democratic State*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Cohen, Elizabeth G (1986), *Designing Groupwork: Strategies for Heterogeneous Classrooms*, New York, Teachers College Press.

Cornbleth, Catherine (1990), *Curriculum in Context*, London, Falmer Press.

Crichlow, Warren, Susan Goodwin, Gaya Shakes, and Ellen Swartz (1991), "Multicultural ways of knowing: implications for practice," *Boston Journal of Education* vol.172, no.2, pp.101-117.

Cuban, Larry (1990), "Reforming again, again, and again," *Educational Researcher*, vol.19, no.1 (January), pp.63-71.

Cunningham, Gregg L (1986), "Blowing the whistle on global education," paper for U.S. Department of Education.

Dawson, Richard, Kenneth Prewitt, and Karen Dawson (1977), *Political Socialization*, Boston, Little, Brown.

Delpit, Lisa (1988), "The Silenced dialogue: power and pedagogy in educating other people's children," *Harvard Educational Review*, vol.58, no,3 (August), pp.280-298.

Deutch, Morton (1973), *The Resolution of Conflict*, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Dewey, John (1916/1966), *Democracy and Education*, New York, Free Press.

Duggan, Susan, David Grossman, and Steven Torpe (1986), "Curriculum content, instructional strategies, and classroom climate: classroom observations of global education," paper for American Educational Research Assn.

Ehman, Lee (1970), "Normative discourse and attitude change in the social studies classroom," *High School Journal*, vol. 54 (November), pp.76-83.
Ehman, Lee (1980), "The American school in the political socialization process," *Review of Educational Research*, vol.50 (Spring).
Ellsworth, Elizabeth (1988), "Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working though the repressive myths of critical pedagogy," paper for Conference on Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice.
Engle, Shirley H. and Anna S. Ochoa (1988), *Education for Democratic Citizenship*, New York, Teachers College Press.
Erickson, Frederick (1972), "What makes school ethnography ethnographic?" paper for American Educational Research Association.
Eyler, Janet (1980), "Citizenship education for conflict," *Theory and Research in Social Education*, vol.8, no.2, pp.11-26.
Feiman-Nemser, Sharon and Robert E. Floden (1986), "The Cultures of teaching" in M. Wittrock (ed), *Handbood of Research on Teaching*, New York, Macmillan, pp.505-526.
Festinger, Leon (1964), *Conflict, Decision, and Dissonance*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
Fine, Michelle (1987), "Silencing in public schools," *Language Arts*, vol.64, no.2, pp.157-174.
Fine, Michelle (1991) *Framing Dropouts*, Albany, State University of New York Press.
Galtung, Johan (1974), *Schooling and Future Society*, Oslo, University of Oslo.
Gilligan, Carol (1982), *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
Giroux, Henry (1988), *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
Goldenson, Dennis (1978), "An Alternate view about the role of the secondary school in political socialization, *Theory and Research in Social Education* vol. 6, no.1 (March), pp.44-72.
Goodlad, John (1985), *A Place Called School*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
Grossman, David L (1976), *Educational Climates and Attitudes Toward Dissent: a study of political socialization of conflict norms in adolescents*, Stanford University, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.
Harwood, Angela (1991), "The Difference between 'Democracy sucks' and 'I may become a politician': views from three high school civics classes," paper for American Educational Research Association.
Harwood, Angela and Carole L. Hahn (1992), "Gender and civics learning," paper for American Educational Research Association.
Horton, Myles and Paulo Freire (1990), *We Make the Road by Walking: Conversations on Education and Social Change*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
Jackson, Philip W. (1968), *Life in Classrooms*, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Jencks, Christopher (1985), "How Much do high school students learn?" *Sociology of Education*, vol.58 (April).
Jennings, M. Kent, K.Langton and R. Niemi (1974), in Jennings and Niemi, *The Political Character of Adolescence*, Princeton, Princeton University.
Johnson, David W. and Roger T. Johnson (1979), "Conflict in the classroom: controversy and learning," *Review of Educational Research*, vol.49.
Joy, Carrol (1990), *Believing is Seeing: Attitudes and assumptions that affect learning about development*, New York, National Clearinghouse on Development Education.
Kelly, Gail P. and A. S. Nihlen (1982), "Schooling and the Reproduction of Patriarchy," M. Apple (ed), *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education*, London, Routledge.
Kirkwood, Toni Fuss (1991), "Global education as a change agent," in K. Tye (ed), *Global Education: from Thought to Action*, Alexandria, VA, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Kirp, David L. (1991), "The Battle of the books: the new tribalists want to trash California's textbooks...," *Image (San Francisco Examiner* Sunday magazine) February 24, pp.17-25.
Ladson-Billings (1992), "The Multicultural Mission: Unity and Diversity," *Social Education* vol.. 56 (September), pp.308-310.
Lamy, Steven L. (1983), "Defining global education," *Educational Research Quarterly*, vol.8.
Lamy, Steven L. (1991), "Global education: a conflict of images," in K. Tye (ed), *Global Education: from Thought to Action*, Alexandria, VA, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development,
Lather, Patti (1986), "Research as praxis," *Harvard Educational Review* vol.56 no.3 (August), pp.257-277.
Liben, Lynn S. (1987), "Approaches to development and learning: conflict and congruence," in L. Liben (ed), *Development and Learning: Conflict or Congruence?* Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Lincoln, Abraham, in Cuomo, Mario and Harold Holzer, eds (1990) *Lincoln on Democracy*, New York, HarperCollins, pp.62-63.
Lortie, Dan C. (1975), *Schoolteacher: a Sociological Study*, Chicago, University of Chicago.

McCarthy, Cameron (1988), "Rethinking liberal and radical perspectives on racial inequality in schooling," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol 58, no.3 (August), pp.265-279.
McNeil, Linda (1986), *Contradictions of Control: School Structure and School Knowledge*, New York, Routledge.
McNeil, Linda (1981), "Negotiating classroom knowledge: beyond acheivement and socialization," *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol.13, no.4, p.313-328.
Merelman, Richard M (1990), "The Role of conflict in children's political learning," in O. Ichilov (ed), *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*, New York, Teachers College Press, pp.47-65.
Metz, Mary Haywood (1978), *Classrooms and Corridors*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
Metz, Mary Haywood (1986), *Different by Design*, New York, Routledge.
National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools (1989), *Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century*, American Historical Association, Carnegie Foundation, National Council for the Social Studies, Organization of American Historians.
Nelson-Barber, Sharon and Terry Meier (1990), "Multicultural context a key factor in teaching," *Academic Connections*, College Board (Spring), pp.1-11.
Newmann, Fred (1985), "The Radical perspective on social studies: a synthesis and critique," *Theory and Research in Social Education*, vol.13, no.1, pp.1-18.
Novak, Michael, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and Anne Crutcher (1978), *Values in an American Government Textbook: Three Appraisals*. Washington, DC, Georgetown University.
Piaget, Jean (1955), *The Child's Construction of Reality*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Prewitt, Kenneth (ed) (1971), *Education and Political Values*, Nairobi, East African Publishing House.
Ravitch, Diane (1990), "Diversity and democracy: multicultural education in America," *American Educator*, (Spring), pp.16-48.
Reardon, Betty (1982), "Disarmament education as world order inquiry," *Teachers College Record*, special issue on "Education for peace and disarmament," vol.84, no.1 (Fall), pp.137-151.
Reardon, Betty (1988), *Comprehensive Peace Education*, New York, Teachers College Press.
Resnick, Lauren B. (1987), *Education and Learning to Think*, National Academy Press.
Rokeach, Milton (1960), *The Open and Closed Mind*, New York, Basic Books.
Rose, Mike (1989), *Lives on the Boundary... America's Educational Underclass*, New York, Penguin.
Sears, David O. (1990), "Whither Political socialization research?" in O.Ichilov (ed), *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*, New York, Teachers College Press, pp.69-97.
Sewall, Gilbert T. (1988), "American history textbooks: where do we go from here?" *Phi Delta Kappan* vol.69. no.8 (April), pp.552-558.
Shor, Ira (1986), "Equality is excellence" *Harvard Educational Review*, vol.56, no.4, pp.406-426.
Sigel, Roberta (1990), "The Case for educating for gender equality," in O.Ichilov (ed), *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*, New York, Teachers College Press, pp.243-265.
Simonton, Rick and Scott Walker, eds (1988) *The Graywolf Annual Five: Multicultural Literacy*, Saint Paul, Graywolf Press.
Sizer, Theodore R (1984), *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin.
Sleeter, Christine E. and C.A. Grant (1987), "An Analysis of multicultural education in the United States," *Harvard Educational Review*, vol.57, no.4, pp.421-444.
Smith, Karl, David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson (1981), "Can Conflict be constructive? Controversy versus concurrence seeking in learning groups," *Journal of American Psychology* vol.73, no.5, pp.651-663.
Sniderman, Paul (1975), *Personality and Democratic Politics*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
Soley, Mary, "Controversial issues as viewed by social studies teachers," *Social Education*, (October).
Spender, Dale and Sarah, eds (1988), *Learning to Lose: Sexism and Education*, London, Women's Press.
Swidler, Ann (1979), *Organization Without Authority*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Torney, Judith V. (1977), "The International attitudes and knowledge of adolescents in nine countries," *International Journal of Political Education* vol.1, pp.3-20.
Torney-Purta, Judith (1990), "From Attitudes and knowledge to schemata" in O.Ichilov (ed), *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*, New York, Teachers College Press.
Torney-Purta, Judith (1989), "Political cognition and its restructuring in young people," *Human Development*, vol.32, pp.14-23.
Trecker, Janice Law (1974), "Women in U.S. history textbooks," in J. Stacey et.al. (eds), *And Jill Came Tumbling Down: Sexism in American Education*, New York, Dell.

Tucker, Jan L. (1990), "Global change and American citizenship education: the vital role of history," *Social Education*, (September), pp.312-315.
Wallerstein, Nina (1987), "Problem-solving education: Freire's method for transformation," in I. Shor (ed), *Freire for the Classroom*, Portsmouth, NH, Boynton/Cook.
Weiler, Hans (1972), "Political socialization and the political system: consensual and conflictual linkage concepts," in M. Kirst (ed), *State, School, and Politics*, Lexington, MA, D.C.Heath.
Westholm, Anders, Arne Lindquist and Richard Niemi (1990), "Education and the making of the informed citizen: political literacy and the outside world," in O.Ichilov (ed), *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*, New York, Teachers College Press, pp.177-204.
Wien, Barbara, ed (1987), *Peace and World Order Studies: a Curriculum Guide* (Fourth Edition), New York, World Policy Institute.
Wilson, Suzanne M. and Samuel Wineburg (1988), "Peering at history through different lenses," *Teachers College Record*, vol.89, no.4, pp.525-539.